National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE USE OF HISTORY IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY:

AN ANALYSIS OF ALBERTA'S HERITAGE LANGUAGE POLICY, 1971

BY

SCOTT ALLEN KEY

©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF EDUCATION.

IN

HISTORY OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 1991

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-69971-X

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Scott Allen Key

TITLE OF THESIS: The Use of History in Educational Policy: An Analysis of Alberta's Heritage Language Policy, 1971.

DEGREE: Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1991

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Scott Key

(Permanent address)
Scott Key
4115 - 112 A Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T6J 1K6

DATE: August 1, 1991

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled: THE USE OF HISTORY IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY: AN ANALYSIS OF ALBERTA'S HERITAGE LANGUAGE POLICY, 1971 submitted by SCOTT ALLEN KEY in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF EDUCATION in HISTORY OF EDUCATION.

Robert J. Carney

David G Wangler
David G. Wangler

Frank Peters
J. Frank Peters

DATE: July 25, 1991

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my LORD JESUS who not only gave me the ability to accomplish this task but, more importantly, suffered pain, humiliation and death, so that, I could have a close, personal relationship with the Triune God.

ABSTRACT

> It has been said that those who fail to study history are condemned to repeat it and, conversely, that if the leaders of one age see further into the future than did their predecessors, it is because they stand on the shoulders of those who have gone before.
> (Nixon, 1982)

Today, more than ever, the people of this planet are challenged to find solutions to problems which affect not only their quality of life, but life itself in areas such as education, environmental protection, health and social welfare. Of course, one can be interested in any of these areas; however, of special interest, for this study, is the role that governments have in meeting these challenges. There are many components which make up the public policy-making process, but the use of history is often overlooked because most do not see history as a necessary component of the process. However, Ernest R. May and Richard E. Neustadt, who have done pioneer work in this field at Harvard University, argue that all policy-makers use history in their decisions, but most do so badly. Thus, the relationship between history and public policy is an area where more work needs to be done.

Although some policy-makers would express little or no interest in the past, there is a need for the proper use of history in the public policy-making process. This thesis explored the basis for using nistory in the public policy-making process and how history can properly be used in this process. This investigation served as a basis from which an analysis of the development of the Heritage

Language Policy of Alberta (1971) was accomplished to determine the appropriateness of the policy and whether and how the policymakers used history in the policy's development.

The analysis of Alberta's Heritage Language Policy revealed that the proper use of history was never really considered by policymakers involved in the development of this policy. In fact, upon closer examination, it was determined that the Modified Neustadt and May Techniques or any similar techniques could have brought marginal improvements to the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta. These findings suggested that the use of the "Modified Techniques" could be beneficial for future policy analysis and development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my Supervisor, Robert Carney, whose expertise and patience has guided and encouraged me throughout the course of my thesis work. I am also grateful for the words of advice and encouragement that Frank Peters and David Wangler offered along the way. As well, I would like to thank the Camrose Normal School Memorial Scholarship Committee for their encouragement and financial support of my thesis work.

Most of all, I would like to thank my family: my mother, Shirley, who always had words of encouragement when they were most needed, my father, Robert, who has played a significant role in the development of my character, my sister, Deanna, who thought long ago that I would pursue an academic career and who encouraged me to do so, and my best friend and brother, Rob, who put up with my anxieties and uncertainties and continually encouraged me to "get off my butt and do some work" - THANK YOU!

Finally, I wish to thank Lorie, my kindred spirit, for her encouragement and support over the last year and for the years to come.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: Delimitations and Rationale 1

Introduction 1
The Need for this Study 4
Statement of the General Problem 6
Statement of Sub-Problems 6
Delimitations of this Study 8
Limitations of this Study 10
Sources of Data 10
Method of Procedure 12

CHAPTER TWO: The Relevance of History 14

Introduction 14
The Importance of History 17
The Role of History 21
The Nature of History 23
Summary 37

CHAPTER THREE: The Task of the Historian 38

Introduction 38
The Problems of History 41
The Historian's Methods 54
Neustadt and May's Methods 62
The Development of the "Modified Techniques" 75
Summary 79

CHAPTER FOUR: Placing the Heritage Language Policy in a Broader Historical Context 80

Introduction 80
The Changing Composition of Canadian Society 82
The Policy of Multiculturalism 96
The Effects on Formal Education 102
The Heritage Language Policy 122
Summary 132

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

CHAPTER FIVE: The Use of History in the Development of the Heritage Language Policy 134

Introduction 134
Review of the "Modified Techniques" 136
The Development of the Policy 138
The Use of History 144
Application of the "Modified Techniques" 149
Summary 161
Conclusions 164
Suggestions for Future Research 173

BIBLIOGRAPHY 174

APPENDICES 183

Appendix A: Section 150 183
Appendix B: Interview Participants 184
Appendix C: Summary of Neustadt and May's "Mini-methods" 186

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: The Sequence of Neustadt and May's "Mini-methods" 65

FIGURE 2: The Sequence of the "Modified Techniques" 75

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: A Comparison of the Percentage of the Population which is neither of British nor French Ethnic Origin between Alberta and Canada . 124

CHAPTER 1

DELIMITATIONS AND RATIONALE

INTRODUCTION

Canada is a nation of great diversity. Not only is there great regional diversity, but there is also great ethnic diversity within Canada. Beginning with the aboriginal people - who were not a homogeneous group but a collection of diverse cultural and linguistic communities - and continuing on with the first European settlers, Canada has always been a land of ethnic diversity. The twentieth century has seen a significant increase in the size and diversity of Canada's population. This diversity has been viewed both as constructive and destructive for Canada as a nation; however, during the past three decades, "Unity in diversity!" has been used as a rallying cry by the champions of 'multiculturalism' in Canada.

Today, it is generally acknowledged that the term 'multiculturalism' is a Canadian creation referring to the situation where "diverse groups and communities are free to retain their respective identities while joining one another as equal partners in a united country."[1] This is how many people around the world envision Canada, that is, as a nation where diversity is recognized and encouraged. In fact, both federal and provincial politicians from a variety of political parties hold this view of multiculturalism and believe that multiculturalism is a basic characteristic of Canadian society. Alberta is no exception. The present Government of Alberta believes that multiculturalism is an essential element in the life of the province. It contends that its policies related to multiculturalism confirm "Alberta's long established commitment to multiculturalism."[2] However, upon closer examination (which will occur later), this commitment to multiculturalism turns out to be a recent historical development.

---

[1] Department of the Secretary of State for Canada: Multiculturalism, Multiculturalism . . . being Canadian (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1987), p. 3.

Before the 1960s, the majority of Canadians, especially politicians, did not consider ethnic diversity as a unifying factor. The role of government was not to promote and enhance Canada's multicultural character. Instead the Anglophone majority and the politicians representing this group believed that what was needed was one culture and one language to unify the country and help everyone become "Canadian". Once again, Alberta can be included in this generalization concerning Canada. From its inception as a province in 1905, Alberta maintained the policy of English only as a language of instruction until 1968[3] in order to help the immigrant population become "Canadian". Although the use of French and other languages was allowed, the Department of Education regulations were structured to make the use of languages other than English difficult. Thus, contrary to the present government's understanding, Alberta's commitment to multiculturalism is a recent phenomenon.

---

[2] Alberta Multiculturalism Commission, Multiculturalism: Focus for the 90's (Edmonton, 1989), p. 9.

[3] In 1968 the Government of Alberta amended the School Act to allow French to be used as a language of instruction subject to Departmental regulations.

Nevertheless, putting this discrepancy concerning the Government of Alberta's commitment to multiculturalism aside for the moment, in the past two decades, the federal government along with several provinces have recognized the contribution of ethnic groups (other than English and French) to Canada. This recognition has translated into a variety of policies and programs, which fall under the broad policy of multiculturalism, with the goal of encouraging the maintenance of Canada's ethnic groups. These policies and programs have reached into many different areas; however, education has been and continues to be seen as having a key role in the promotion of the policies of multiculturalism. Yet education can and does mean many things to many people. In a broad sense the term refers to the intellectual and moral training of an individual which can occur in a variety of contexts such as families, religious organizations and schools. In a democratic society, such as Canada, it is not possible to control most of these educational influences; however, at present, the majority of students in Canada attend a publicly-funded school system which must meet specific curriculum and teacher qualification requirements. Thus, it is mainly in this realm - the school - that provincial governments have attempted to implement their policies on multiculturalism.

Here again, Alberta can be included in this group of provincial governments. In the early 1970s, the Government of Alberta made some important changes that coincided with the federal government's policy on multiculturalism. Influenced in part by the federal policy, the Government of Alberta developed the Heritage Language Policy which made it possible for languages other than

English or French to be used as languages of instruction.[4] It is this policy shift by the Government of Alberta, in particular, the extent to which historical information was used or misused in the policy's development and the possible implications this may have, that will be the focus of this study.

THE NEED FOR THIS STUDY

Why is an analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy centering on the extent to which historical information was used or misused in the policy's development needed?

Today, more than ever, the people of Canada are challenged to find solutions to problems which effect not only their quality of life, but the survival of their nation. The recent constitutional problems are but an expression of the great diversity which exists in Canada. But, Canadians are faced with important issues concerning how they live in their environment and with each other. If these challenges are to be met then business, government and other agencies (e.g. Human Rights Commissions) will need to work together to find solutions and, if necessary, to adopt new policies in areas such as education, environmental protection, health and social welfare.

Although any of these areas would make for an important and interesting study, the focus of this study will fall under the broad category of education. Of course, there are many aspects to education; however, the issue of what language of instruction will be used is crucial for any educational process. It would seem obvious but worthwhile to state that the choice of which language a student learns in is crucial to the student's learning experience. Thus, the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta has significance because it deals with the Government of Alberta's policy on languages of instruction.

---

[4] The School Act, 1971, Section 150 (Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1971).

Given the educational significance of the Heritage Language Policy, why study the development of the policy and not the implementation? An analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy will provide some insights not only into the policy, which could benefit any evaluation of this policy, but also into the process of public policy-making. These insights can then be used in future policy analysis and development. Thus, an analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy will provide a better understanding of the broader public policy-making process along with the specific policy. But, why use history as the tool of analysis?

There are many components which make up the public policy-making process, but the use of history is often overlooked because most do not see history as a necessary component of the process. However, Ernest R. May and Richard E. Neustadt, who have done pioneer work in this field at Harvard University, argue that all policy-makers use history in their decisions, but most do so badly.[5]

---

[5] Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May, Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers (New York: The Free Press, 1986).

The result is that an area where more work needs to be done is: how history can be used properly in the development of public policy? Thus, an analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy provides an opportunity to combine the analysis of an important educational policy with a relatively new analytical approach.

STATEMENT OF THE GENERAL PROBLEM

The main purpose of this study is twofold: first, to develop a relatively new analytical approach to the analysis of public policy and second, to use this new approach to examine the process of the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta which appears in the 1971 School Act as Section 150 (see Appendix A). This examination will focus on determining whether the policy was appropriate and on whether and how historical information was used appropriately or misused by the policy-makers in the development of this policy.

STATEMENT OF SUB-PROBLEMS

Although some policy-makers would express little or no interest in the past, there is a need for the proper use of history in the public policy-making process. The first problem that this study will explore will be the basis for using history in the public policy-making process. A necessary part of this study will be an attempt to answer the question: what type of history is needed? The answer to this question will be found by exploring the notion of history over time and then drawing some conclusions as to what historical criteria need to be applied to the public policy-making process. Once it has been determined what type of history should be used then it will be necessary to develop a specific methodology for the analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta.

With the rationale and the methodology as a base, the study's focus shifts back to the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta. There are two major problems which will be examined: first, to determine whether the Heritage Language Policy was appropriate given the development of the policy problem and the context in which the solution was implemented. Second, to determine to what extent historical information was used appropriately or misused in the development of the policy and the possible implications this may have.

Thus, this study has three major problems that will be examined. First, can history be used in the public policy-making process and if so, to develop a methodology to use history in the analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta. Second, to use part of this methodology to determine whether this policy was appropriate given the broader historical context. And finally, to use the other part of this methodology to determine whether and how the policy-makers used history in the development of the Heritage Language Policy and the possible implications this may have.

DELIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

The delimitations of this study are as follows:

1. It is beyond the scope of this study to discuss the interdependency that exists between various policy issues/areas or the interdependency that exists between business, government and other agencies. Suffice it to say that such interdependency exists. This is not to contend that studies in these areas would not be of value; however, for the purposes of this study, the field of inquiry will be restricted to government policy, specifically in the area of schooling.

2. Although the policies and programs related to multiculturalism have reached into many different areas, the schools have been given a key role in promoting the goals and objectives of multiculturalism. Thus, it is in this realm - the school - that provincial government policy will be examined.

3. This study will not examine the policies related to second language instruction, that is, where languages other than the language of instruction are taught as separate courses. Instead this study will be limited to the policies related to the language which is used in the instruction of the student, hereafter referred to as the language of instruction. More specifically, this study will be limited to the shift in Alberta's policy on languages of instruction in 1971. This policy is termed "the Heritage Language Policy" which refers to the 1971 amendment to the School Act, in particular,

Section 150 (see Appendix A) which permits the use of any language as a language of instruction subject to Departmental regulations.

It is important to note that the use of any language other than English or French as a language of instruction falls under the broad category of "bilingual education". The term "bilingual education" refers to the students receiving instruction in English or French and any other language. Under Departmental regulations, instruction in any language other than English or French is limited in order for the students to receive instruction in one of Canada's two official languages. Thus, because of the regulations which accompanied the 1971 amendment to the School Act, the Heritage Language Policy deals with bilingual education.

4. No attempt will be made to analyze or evaluate the subsequent implementation of the Heritage Language Policy. This study will be limited to an analysis of the background and development of the languages of instruction policy which allowed languages other than English or French to be used as languages of instruction in publicly-funded schools in Alberta.

5. This study will not attempt to determine whether or how individuals outside the Government of Alberta or the Department of Education used appropriately or misused history in the development of the Heritage Language Policy.

6. This study will be based on available published and unpublished material as well as personal interviews with significant individuals involved in the development of this policy.

LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

1. As it was not the practice of two major principals, namely the Minister of Education (1968-1971) and his Deputy Minister, to communicate through briefings or memoranda, but rather most of their communication was verbal. Thus, the use of unpublished material, namely material found in the Provincial Archives of Alberta, was limited.

2. Although an attempt was made to contact a large number of principals involved in the development of Alberta's Heritage Language Policy, the study was limited because some of the principals, such as the Minister of Education's executive assistant, could not be reached.

3. This study's discussion on the development of the Heritage Language Policy was limited because of the reliance on the personal recollections of the principals interviewed regarding events which occurred between twenty and twenty-five years ago.

4. The principals, mentioned in number 3, were interviewed only once and no follow-up interviews were held.

SOURCES OF DATA

The sources of data for this study can be grouped into four general categories: unpublished materials, printed public documents, interviews and inquiries and secondary sources.

1. Unpublished materials:

The most important sources of unpublished materials used in this study were the files and papers that have been placed with the Provincial Archives of Alberta. These included: the files and papers of Premier Strom and cabinet ministers, especially the Minister of Education, files of the deputy minister and other officials of the Department of Education, files of various Branches of the Department of Education, especially the Curriculum Branch as well as the files related to the Commission of Educational Planning (the Worth Commission).

The contents of these files and papers varied; however, they included: correspondence both departmental and ministerial, curriculum committee minutes, departmental and interdepartmental memoranda, departmental briefings and reports, Executive Council material, newspaper clippings (selected for the Minister of Education), public submissions to the provincial government and the Worth Commission, as well as speeches made by the Minister of Education and the Premier in the Legislative Assembly and elsewhere.

2. Printed public documents:

The following public documents were used extensively in this study: the census of Canada and other publications from Statistics Canada, the ordinances of the North-West Territories, the statutes of Alberta, the annual reports of the Department of Education (Alberta), the regulations of the Department of Education (Alberta) as well as the curriculum guides of the Department of Education (Alberta).

3. Interviews and inquiries:

Interviews were conducted with:

a) former Department of Education officials, who held their positions between 1968 and 1971, including the Deputy Minister, the Director of Curriculum, the Associate Director of Curriculum.

b) former cabinet ministers including the Minister of Education. c) other significant individuals involved in the policy including two influential members of the Ukrainian community.

A list of the interview participants is found in Appendix B.

4. Secondary sources:

The secondary sources used in this study were primarily demographical and historical studies. The sources covered a variety of topics including broad topics such as historiography and policy as well as more specific topics such as education, immigration, language and multiculturalism. A complete list is found at the end of this study in the "Bibliography".

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

This study is divided into two main parts. The first part is made up of two chapters and sets forth the rationale and methodology for using history in the analysis of public policy. Chapter two is a discussion of the necessary components that must be present in any historical information used in the public policy-making process. The next chapter continues this discussion in order to develop the rationale for using history in the public policy-making process. With this rationale the remainder of chapter three is used to design a methodology for using history in the analysis of the Heritage Language Policy. The analysis of the policy is done in the last two chapters. Chapter four places the Heritage Language Policy in its broader historical context while at the same time determines whether the policy was appropriate given that broader historical context. The final chapter applies the specific methodology - the Modified Techniques - to the development of the Heritage Language Policy in order to determine whether and how the policy-makers used or misused history in the development of this policy. The study concludes with some general observations on how history can be used to bring about marginal and possibly significant improvements in the public policy-making process.

CHAPTER 2

THE RELEVANCE OF HISTORY

INTRODUCTION

As discussed in chapter one, more than ever before the people of Canada are challenged to find solutions to problems which effect their quality of life. Canadians are faced with important issues in areas such as education, environmental protection, health and social welfare. Of course, there are many important and interesting issues in each of these areas; however, for the purposes of this study, the field of inquiry will be restricted to government policy in the area of education.

Yet even the general area of education must be narrowed since it is not possible to control most educational influences in a democratic society. At present, the majority of students in Alberta attend a publicly-funded school system which must meet specific curriculum and teacher qualification requirements. Thus, it is in this realm - the school - that the shifts in policy by the Government of Alberta will be examined.

In the early 1970s, the Government of Alberta made some important changes that coincided with the federal government's policy on multiculturalism. Influenced in part by the federal policy, the Government of Alberta developed the Heritage Language Policy which made it possible for languages other than English or French to be used as languages of instruction.[1] It is this policy shift by the Government of Alberta, in particular, the extent to which historical information was used appropriately or misused in the policy's development and the possible implications this may have, that will be the focus of this study. However, before this examination can begin, it is necessary to look at the nature of government policy and how it is made in order to understand the role that historical information has in this process. Another term which is synonymous with government policy is 'public policy', but what is meant by 'public policy'? There is no single definition of public policy. Not only do academics and policy-makers disagree, but it would also be difficult to have the general public agree upon a single definition. William Dunn, professor at the University of Pittsburgh, has defined public policy as a "long series of more or less related choices, including decisions not to act, made by governmental bodies and officials."[2] Yet George Edwards and Ira Sharkansky see public policy as the goals or purposes of government programs.[3] And still others describe public policy as the implementation of government intentions and rules (laws). Thus, it is necessary to have a broad definition that can encompass the above aspects, which means that in the broadest sense, public policy is what governments choose to do or not do concerning specific issues.

---

[1] The School Act, 1971, Section 150 (Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1971).

[2] William N. Dunn, Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1981), p. 61.

[3] George C. Edwards III and Ira Sharkansky, The Policy Predicament: Making and Implementing Public Policy (San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1978), p. 2.

Another feature of public policy is that it can either be explicit or implicit, that is it can be explicitly stated through laws or in the speeches of leading officials or it can be implied in government programs and actions.[4] But regardless of how public policy is defined or how it is articulated, there is always some type of process that has cccurred in order for the policy(s) to be formulated. That is, there has been some process in which the policy problem and alternatives have been analyzed to allow for a course of action to be decided upon. Of course, there are many approaches to the process of policy analysis and even a survey of these approaches would make for an entire thesis; thus, what is needed is a broad understanding of the public policy analysis process. In Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction, Dunn describes public policy analysis as "an applied social science discipline which uses multiple methods of inquiry and argument to produce and transform policy-relevant information that may be utilized in political settings to resolve policy problems."[5] Although the notion of policy analysis as a separate discipline is relatively new, the process of supplying policy makers with policy-relevant information to assist in the making of decisions is not. Thus, whether public policy analysis is considered a separate discipline or an extension of existing social science disciplines, it uses a variety of methods to produce the policy-relevant information that policy-makers use in their decision-making. "The aim of policy analysis throughout history has therefore been to provide policy makers with information that could be used to exercise reasoned judgement in finding solutions for practical problems."[6]

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] Dunn, op. cit., p. 35.

Dunn goes on to say that any public policy analysis process should attempt to answer these questions: "Does a policy exist and how did it come about? What are the expected future consequences?", "Of what worth is a policy, and according to whose values?" and "What should the policy be? Is it feasible as well as desirable?"[7] It is possible to deal with these questions in a number of different ways; however, these questions, in connection with the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta, will be approached from an historical analysis approach. The specific methodology will be discussed in the next chapter, but what remains to be answered is why use a historical analysis approach?

THE IMPORTANCE OF HISTORY

Although some policy-makers would express little or no interest in the past,[8] Ernest May and Richard Neustadt (both professors at Harvard University) discovered that policy-makers actually used "history in their decisions, at least for advocacy or for comfort, whether they knew any or not."[9] What they argue, through their experience with policy-makers at the federal level in the United States, is that policy-makers are often influenced by what they believe about the past, not what actually happened in the past. That is, policy-makers use what they believe to be history to form analogies and/or parallels between the past and the present, and from these incorrect analogies and/or parallels envision the future.[10] Forming incorrect analogies and/or parallels cause policy-makers to misunderstand trends or problems and make unfounded assumptions about trends continuing into the future. Thus, a more discriminating use of history "might help people who must make choices or must estimate the future to free themselves from the analogies, parallels, or trend-readings which they might otherwise unthinkingly apply."[11]

---

[6] Ibid., p. 7.

[7] Ibid., p. 38.

[8] For a discussion of some policy-makers who expressed little interest in the proper use of history refer to chapter 5 of this thesis.

Thus, with many policy-makers using history badly, there is a need for the proper use of history in the public policy-making process. Richard Nixon, former President of the United States, in his book Leaders, expressed the opinion that history is important for leaders which means by implication that it is important for the solution of contemporary problems and choosing courses for the future.[12] This does not mean the future can be predicted. It may be possible to make projections about what may occur, but prediction with certainty seems less likely.

---

[9] Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May, Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers (New York: The Free Press, 1986), p. xii.

[10] Ernest R. May, Lessons of the Past: The Uses and Misuses of History in American Foreign Policy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. ix.

[11] Ibid., p. xiii.

[12] Richard M. Nixon, Leaders (New York: Warner Books, Inc., 1982).

"The future is a combination of factors - the historical forces and circumstances of the past and present, which we can try to weigh and assess, and the human decisions and responses that have not yet been made."[13] Thus, there is a knowable component - events in the past - and an unknowable component - events yet to occur - that make up the future. This means that time and energy should be spent on the knowable component which means that the study of history does have a role in the determination of the choices and pursuits of society. It is vital that policy-makers understand the origins of present economic, political and social structures as well as the roots of tensions in society. But, if all the study of history can do is explain the present circumstances then how important can it really be?

Nothing occurs overnight. Change takes time and history, afterall, is the study of humankind over time. Without a knowledge of history it would not be possible to understand contemporary problems or to take part in contemporary debates. The study of history is indeed necessary to provide knowledge of the past that will allow for greater understanding of the present. And greater understanding of the present can allow for greater freedom in determining present events.[14] But, if this control of the present is conditional on knowledge of the past, is it not important to know what is meant by the past? Some would attempt to define the past through the use of a specific time frame (e.g. years, decades or centuries). However, from a philosophical perspective, "the present, after all, is only a fleeting instant, and everything we are conscious of is already in the past."[15] Thus, it could be said that for all practical purposes there is only the past and/or the future. It would be easy to get bogged down in a philosophical discussion about time, but that is not the purpose here. Suffice it to say that for the purposes of this study, the past will include those events which have already happened and the future, those events which have yet to occur. As well, it would seem appropriate at this point to make certain distinctions about the past. In a general sense, the past can be divided between the 'recent' and the 'remote'. Obviously, there are varying degrees of 'recentness' and 'remoteness' and it would be possible to get bogged down with attempting to clearly define these terms. However, for the purposes of this study, the 'recent past' will refer to those things which make up the last two generations because in the public policy-making process personal experience is often used and generally, few participants from beyond two generations are available for consultation. This means that the 'remote past' will refer to that which makes up the remainder of human experience.

---

[13] Robert V. Daniels, Studying History: How and Why (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1981), p. 109.

[14] Arthur Marwick, The Nature of History (3rd edition) (London: MacMillan Education, Ltd., 1989), p. 17.

---

[15] Daniels, op. cit., p. 6.

THE ROLE OF HISTORY

Regardless of how time is viewed, history does have a role in the public policy-making process. How can history be used in public policy-making? There appear to be several major ways in which history can be utilized. First, policy-makers can use existing historical research in the process. This option is the one put forward by May who believes that what is needed is policy analysts who are "sensitive to the variety and complexity of the past, the tentativeness of most historical reconstructions, and the many hazards associated with claiming that one occurrence is 'like' another."[16] Although May is correct that historians do not necessarily need to be involved in the policy-making process, it would seem to be appropriate for historians to be involved in the process. Why? Historians are needed to examine the past and to use their research and interpretative skills in developing the explanations for the current situation and structures. If they are to produce the needed policy-relevant information then it is highly likely that they will be needed to determine its significance. Thus, another option is for historians to be directly involved in the policy-making process by directing their research on policy problems in order to produce policy-relevant information. This information can then be synthesized along with the information from others such as economists or sociologists and used to make decisions by the policy analyst.

---

[16] May, op. cit., p. xiii.

There is one other way in which historians can be involved in the public policy-making process. They can be helpful in the analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of a policy already in place, that is, history can be used to determine whether a policy was appropriate given the development of the problem and the context in which the solution was implemented. This third use of the study of history in the public policy-making process will be the one used in this study and will be discussed in the next chapter. As well, this study will answer the question to what extent was historical information used appropriately or misused in the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta and what implications this may have..

Although these uses of the study of history would seem logical, the question that remains is what type of history is needed. Regardless of how the study of history is used in the public policy-making process, any history that would be used in this process needs to have both accuracy and relevance. This may seem apparent; however, the last one hundred and fifty years has seen a shift in the focus of the discipline of history. For centuries historians had seen their work as having relevance for the solution of contemporary problems; however, with the advent of the scientific age came a shift towards studying history for its own sake.[17] What seemed to be obvious, is not obvious; thus, it is necessary to demonstrate why there is a need to combine the sense of relevance of earlier centuries with the accuracy of the last one hundred and fifty years. This will reveal the type of history that is required for functional use in the public policy-making process.

---

[17] Gordon Connell-Smith and Howell A. Lloyd, The Relevance of History (London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1972), p. 7ff.

THE NATURE OF HISTORY

It is important to point out that there is not a consensus regarding the term history. Most would agree that history involves the study of humankind in the past - both recent and remote - but the disagreements begin over the purpose and methods of studying the past. What has happened in the development of the study of history is that either accuracy or relevance has been emphasized. But what is needed is for both to be emphasized. In order to demonstrate this, it is necessary to show that emphasizing one over the other is inappropriate. This will be done through briefly exploring each position and then showing why the two qualities should be combined.

Up to the nineteenth century western historians - those historians from the European/North American tradition - had put relevance over accuracy. This does not mean that historians fabricated the past, in fact some were very concerned with accuracy; however, the overriding principle was relevance. That is, the most important quality of history was the way it could serve as a guide for the future. Of course, it is not feasible to do an exhaustive survey of how historians through the ages have viewed the practise of history, but a brief survey will be sufficient to demonstrate the drawbacks of giving relevance primacy over accuracy.

This brief survey will begin with the man commonly held to be the 'father of history' - Herodotus. In introducing his History, a comprehensive nine volume narrative, Herodotus outlined his purposes which included the need to preserve human records, to glorify the deeds of men and to determine the causes of those deeds.[18] Although Herodotus saw the need to keep records to ensure that the existence of whole civilizations would not be lost, upon clearer examination of his History, it becomes evident that "Herodotus makes no effective discrimination in his History between the skeletal act -for instance, the murder of Candaules by Gyges, which is 'historical'- and the imaginative reality toward which the story reaches."[19] For Herodotus whether something actually happened or not was not all that important. What was important was the presentation of the events and whether the 'truth' would come out. That is, whether the correct character qualities that were desirable were promoted through the narrative. This probably meant that Herodotus embellished his accounts for his readers; however, it was in past experience that Herodotus found guidance for contending with present circumstances.[20] In other words, Herodotus was more concerned with the moral lessons that could be learnt than with factual accuracy.

---

[18] Herodotus, The History (translator: David Greene) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), p. 33.

[19] Ibid., p. 12.

[20] Connell-Smith and Lloyd, op. cit., p. 9.

Herodotus' successor in Greek historiography was Thucydides who in his own History sharply criticized his predecessor. Thucydides did not approve of Herodotus' writing style which was meant to bring delight to the immediate hearer because he thought that history should be written as an account that would last forever not simply for the pleasure of the historian's contemporaries.[21] In addition, Thucydides also was critical of Herodotus' lack of attention to the question - But did it really happen? Thucydides believed that "the historian's duty [was] to discover the truth and to convey its significance to his reader."[22] Detail was very important because precise detail could allow for future recognition of how human beings react to classic situations and "it is upon the immutability of man's collective character, and hence the predictability of his reactions to classic situations, that Thucydides rests part of his claim for the permanent value of his history."[23] For Herodotus the relevance of history was found in its colourful description of the past which could serve as a guide for the future. Thucydides was more cautious and saw history "as having a cautionary value, illustrating how human weaknesses can become the instruments of mass destruction in a political environment."[24]

---

[21] Stephen Usher, The Historians of Greece and Rome (London: Hamish Hamilton Ltd., 1969).

[22] Ibid., p. 28.

[23] Ibid., p. 30.

The great Greek and Roman historians who followed Thucydides all looked to the past for reassurance and justification of the political and social structures of their society.[25] In addition, they also saw history as having the ability to teach men and women important moral lessons. Polybius believed that "knowledge of the past is the readiest means men can have of correcting their conduct"[26] and Xenophon affirmed "a belief in the direct and positive moral lessons to be learnt from history by the study of virtue in action."[27] The Romans were greatly influenced by the Greek historiographical tradition. For example Sallust, like Thucydides, wrote contemporary history as a witness to important events.[28] However, unlike Thucydides, Sallust's concern was not with political struggles but with moral decline because he felt that work which focused on moral decline could be used to help correct Roman behaviour.[29] Tacitus also saw history as being used as a guide, that is, through its study guidance for present and future conduct could be gained.[30]

---

[24] Ibid., p. 97.

[25] Connell-Smith and Lloyd, op. cit., p. 11.

[26] Ibid., p. 10.

[27] Usher, op. cit., p. 97.

[28] Ibid., p. 147.

[29] Ibid., p. 153.

[30] Connell-Smith and Lloyd, op. cit., p. 11.

All these great historians of Greece and Rome were very good stylists. They followed the literary traditions of their day and produced works which are still read. Some, like Herodotus and Livy, were less concerned with the facts than with moral lessons which meant that embellishment was, at times, encouraged in order to show the lesson(s) to be learnt. Others, like Thucydides and Sallust, were quite concerned with accuracy, but still saw the practical utility of history. Yet by today's standards their accounts lack factual accuracy because of the heavy reliance on hearsay testimony; nonetheless, "they wrote what they believed to be history."[31]

Generally speaking, the Greek and Roman historians saw history as having relevance for their world's problems; however, during the Medieval period, the importance of history declined because it was commonly believed that men and women were merely fulfilling God's plan with no control over His purpose or over their own destiny.[32] "In consequence, simply to record men's activities was an unimportant task to be discharged, if at all, by unimportant clerks."[33] Although this was true in general, there were some trustworthy histories produced in this period. In 731 Bede wrote one of the best histories of this period, The Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation, which illustrates that the notion of didactic significance of history held by the Greeks and Romans was still in place.[34] In addition to Bede, "the Middle Ages produced historical writers of high literary merit - Matthew Paris and Lambert of Herzford and Froissant - whose testimony to events of their own time was fairly trustworthy."[35] However, historical research methods had still not, by this time, developed and the critical treatment of documents had not begun. That is, the recorded events of the past were accepted without challenge based upon the tradition of the church and what was believed to have happened in the past.[36] History was a sermon. Although it was used to give evidence of the Christian faith, it should be remembered that history as a discipline was still developing.

---

[31] Ibid., p. 12.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Ibid.

The fifteenth and sixteenth centuries saw many important developments which altered historical practise. The Renaissance, Reformation, maritime expansion, domestic political and social change plus intellectual restlessness all combined to question the dogma and traditions of the church.[37] "Scepticism and humanism went hand in hand, each nourished by critical interest in antiquity and its intellectual achievement."[38] Where in the past the majority of people had simply allowed the church to tell them what to believe, men (and women) were increasingly inclined to explore the past for themselves, in order to discover "the relevance of those circumstances to their own uncertain and turbulent age."[39] What resulted was a body of historical writings in which God was still the principal influence, but the actions of men and women were given serious attention. Between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries history was used and often abused to justify both religious beliefs and to guide patriotic action. For example, during the Reformation, Philip Melanchthon used history to demonstrate that the Roman Catholic Church was not the true church and to show how it had degenerated over time.[40] Nevertheless, these centuries saw many important works completed by historians all over Europe. George Gooch described some of these achievements:

---

[34] The Venerable Bede, The Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation (translator: John Stevens) (London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1910).

[35] George P. Gooch, History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1913), p. 1.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Connell-Smith and Lloyd, op. cit., p. 14.

[38] Ibid.

> D'Herbelot summarised existing knowledge of the East .... Marianna presented his countrymen with a national history of Spain .... In Italy the effort of Sigonius to reconstruct the institutions of Rome stands out as an isolated achievement. In England Bacon wrote the Life of Henry VII .... In Germany Conring conducted profound investigations into the origins of German law.[41]

---

[39] Ibid.

[40] Gooch, op. cit., p. 2.

[41] Ibid., p. 4.

Of course, this is only a small sample of the work completed; however, it does serve to demonstrate that much was being done in history.

As well, during this period, the nature of historical research underwent some developmental changes, including the collection of materials and the development of a more critical attitude towards authorities and tradition.[42] The critical study of history was greatly assisted by the general changes that had taken place which made the eighteenth century the era of secular rationalism. This is not to say that all the problems associated with historical research had been solved. These problems included the past being dismissed as being unimportant - this was what individuals like Hume and Voltaire did with the Middle Ages - critical research methods were still in their infancy and there was a great restriction on access to both church and government documents and other sources.[43] Although this period saw history develop into a more critical discipline, this did not take away from it being viewed as having relevance for the present and the future. This notion of learning from the past continued: "the study of Antiquity, and the History of former times, has ever been esteemed highly commendable and useful, not only to improve the minds of men, but also to incite them to virtuous and noble actions."[44]

---

[42] Ibid., p. 5.

[43] Ibid., pp. 10-13.

[44] Royal Charter and Statutes of the Society of Antiquaries of London, 1800, p. 1.

Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, science had had only a limited impact upon history. The move towards developing a more critical approach to historical research was influenced more from the rationalism of the post Renaissance era than from the field of science. However, the nineteenth century would see a shift towards a more scientific approach to history. Yet in the early part of the century, many historians continued to see history's primary importance as having relevance for contemporary problems and the future. For example, the British historian Macauley viewed history as valuable "only as it leads us to form just calculations with respect to the future."[45] Although there were historians such as Burckhardt and Carlyle who continued to put forward the view that history's primary importance should be relevance, the work of Leopold von Ranke brought a shift away from this perspective.

Before Ranke, history was seen to hold "relevance as a means of enabling men to come to terms with contemporary problems;"[46] however, the rise of science in both importance and status caused historians of the day to re-evaluate their discipline. The rise of science was due in part to the influence of the philosophy of 'rationalism' which placed a great deal of importance upon reason. Also, contributing to this rise was the decline of belief in and commitment to orthodox historic Christianity. Proponents of rationalism viewed much of traditional Christianity as based on superstition which could not stand up to reasoned analysis. This meant that there had to be some other explanations for the creation of the world and everyday occurrences. This is where science began to fill in the gap and offer some alternatives to the Christian-based explanations.[47] These science based explanations were arrived at through methods which included dispassionate, minute observation and analysis of evidence.[48] The primacy of relevance for history seemed to give way to the need for accuracy which meant using scientific methods to find the objective facts of history.

---

[45] Connell-Smith and Lloyd, op. cit., p. 18.

[46] Ibid., p. 7.

The shift towards objectivity emerged in the concept of positivism[49] with Leopold von Ranke as one of its champions. Generally speaking, the advocates of positivism were opposed to the application of the historian's moral standards upon the past. Ranke believed that history should be used "simply to show how it really was."[50] This was a reaction to the moralizing histories of the past which were held to lack objectivity. It was felt that an attempt should be made to bring the desired objectivity into history. In this instance, objectivity simply meant that the research procedures and its results would be free from the biases and prejudices of the researcher. More will be said later about the notion of objectivity, suffice it to say that, the idea that history needed to become more objective was based upon the influence of rationalism and science.

---

[47] Leonard M. Marsak, The Nature of Historical Inquiry (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), p. 85.

[48] Connell-Smith and Lloyd, op. cit., p. 33.

[49] Ibid.

[50] Edward H. Carr, What is History? (London: MacMillan & Co., Ltd., 1961), p. 3.

It was the perception of many academics that, through empirical research methods which were designed to gather and produce objective facts, science could bring forward the objective 'truth'.[51] In order to ensure objectivity, one essential aspect of scientific research was the separation required between researcher and subject. Ranke believed that historical research should follow the same pattern as scientific research, that is, that the researcher should be detached from the subject and begin with an hypothesis.[52] Like in science, the hypothesis would be tested based on an analysis of all available sources, especially authentic records. Once the hypothesis was proven, Ranke believed that "though later discoveries may throw clearer and more certain light on details, they can only strengthen his fundamental conceptions of the subject: for truth can be but one."[53]

Just as science was believed to hold the key in the explanation of much of the physical phenomena in the world, so history now had its own phenomena to explain. For historians, positivism meant that their discipline needed to be re-structured away from moralizing history to the accumulation of facts through the careful analysis of available sources. "To history fell the task of demonstrating scientifically how the affairs and institutions of civilised man had changed through time."[54] It was through this shift in focus and practise that the notion - history for its own sake - arose. As the nineteenth century progressed, historians felt that their primary function was to increase the body of historical knowledge, so that, one day there could be an 'universal history' produced. In this system, interpretation of the facts was secondary to the accumulation of knowledge and, with the goal being the latter, it no longer mattered whether there was relevance in what was being studied.[55] That is, whether the specific topic had relevance for the world of the historian's day was no longer important because it was simply one small section of the ever increasing body of historical knowledge.

---

[51] Connell-Smith and Lloyd, op. cit., pp. 33-35.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Leopold von Ranke, History of the Reformation in Germany (London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1845), pp. xvii-xviii.

Out of this nineteenth century shift in focus and practise, which led to the notion of history for its own sake, sprang many types of historians. It is beyond the scope of this study to discuss many of them; however, some general comments can be made about the direction of further developments. Since Ranke, there has been a constant move towards establishing clearer methods for historical research; however, it should be pointed out that there continues to be much disagreement over the purposes and methods of historical research. More will be said later about methodology, for the present it is enough to say that this movement towards establishing acceptable research methods is indeed valuable.

---

[54] Connell-Smith and Lloyd, op. cit., p. 21.

[55] Ibid., pp. 33-40.

Although not all historians agreed with this shift towards a more empirical brand of research, many, such as Carl Hempel and Karl Popper, went further towards making history the science of humankind in time. Individuals like these thought that it was possible to establish general laws -just like science- that would account for human activity.[56] Others, such as William Dray, rejected the notion of general laws for the notion of general concepts (e.g. revolution or war) which allows historians to bring a wide range of facts into a system or pattern.[57] Still others, like Edward Carr, rejected any notion of general laws or concepts because they felt that history dealt with the unique in the human past.[58] Thus, it can be said that there is no generally accepted or agreed upon purpose or methodology for historical research. Even though, for several decades now historians have not thought it possible to produce an 'universal history', still many historians seem to pursue what appears to be an unending accumulation of facts because they believe that facts speak for themselves and that one can never have too many facts. This pursuit of facts regardless of their relevance to contemporary issues or problems makes it possible to generalize by saying that "historians have ceased to practise their discipline with relevance in mind. ... For them, pursuers at last of true learning, research is what matters; and mundane considerations of relevance are a distraction."[59]

---

[56] Carl Hempel, "The Function of General Laws in History" in Theories of History edited by Patrick Gardiner (New York: The Free Press, 1959), pp. 344-355.
William Dray, Philosophy of History (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 5f.

[57] William Dray, ""Explaining What" in History" in Theories of History edited by Patrick Gardiner (New York: The Free Press, 1959), p. 407.

[58] Carr, op. cit., p. 46ff.

Ranke thought that historians should approach their discipline as many scientists approached their various disciplines with a dispassionate, analytical attitude.[60] This meant that historians needed to stop moralizing and using history as a means to learn lessons from the past. Rather historians should conduct their research in a scientific manner, that is, the goal should be to discover the 'truth' about what really happened in the past. In order for this to happen, the historian needed to divorce the past from the present - not allow contemporary problems or thoughts about the future to influence the research.

As the influence of positivism continued to grow in the nineteenth century, "historians sought to emulate the scientists in their dispassionate and minute analysis of evidence."[61] What became important was not what the past could teach, but what actually happened in the past. That is, accuracy became of the utmost importance and this required the development of newly specialized techniques. The historian's purpose had shifted towards simply establishing an accurate knowledge of the past. This, in turn, caused historians to alter the field of study towards particular events/situations which meant that individual historians would study only a small fragment of the past. As the twentieth century progressed, historians began simply to do research and publish articles not for the larger society, but for a small group of fellow historians engaged in similar studies. History as a discipline had moved away from being read and used by many to being pursed by a few academics. Here two things should be pointed out: first, that "it can no longer be contended that what historians are doing will one day (however remote) make possible a definitive, universal history. Yet historians continue to accumulate information about the past as if this were still their objective."[62] Second, histories have been written for the larger audience such as Winston Churchill's accounts of the Second World War; however, these works are generally held in low esteem among professional historians.

---

[59] Connell-Smith and Lloyd, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

[60] Ibid., p. 33.

[61] Ibid.

SUMMARY

Before the nineteenth century, historians placed their emphasis on relevance; however, in the nineteenth and twentieth century, there was a shift away from relevance to accuracy as the primary quality of history. The question that needs to be answered is - Should either of these qualities have primacy over the other? The answer would seem to be no. Historians are members of the society in which they live and each society has its own contemporary problems that should not be ignored. To ignore the contemporary problems of the society in which one lives is to be irresponsible and selfish. Yet at the same time it is irresponsible to distort the facts to serve one own purposes. This means that there needs to be some type of balance between accuracy and relevance. More will be said about this balance in the next chapter. Suffice it to say that, through this brief survey of the development of the study of history, it can be seen that when either accuracy or relevance have been given primacy the history has suffered. That is, when relevance was the primary concern, the reliability of the historical account came into question; whereas, when accuracy was the primary concern, the importance of the work came into question.

---

[62] Ibid., p. 56.

This means that history needs both accuracy and relevance and nowhere is this more true than in the public policy-making process. What policy-makers need is accurate, relevant historical information which can be used in the decision-making process. Thus, whether the historian is doing policy specific research or more general research, it is necessary to combine accuracy and relevance. But, how can this be done? The combining of these two aspects along with the specific methodology for the analysis of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3

THE TASK OF THE HISTORIAN

INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, the discussion centered on the relationship between history and the public policy-making process where it was presented that public policy-makers use history in their decision-making, but that most do so badly. Why is this so? As Neustadt and May argued and demonstrated in Thinking in Time, public policy-makers are influenced by what they believe about the past not what actually happened in the past and use what they believe to form analogies and/or parallels between the past and the present which are then used to envision the future.[1] Thus, the study of history is necessary to provide knowledge of the past that will allow for greater understanding of the present which in turn can allow for greater freedom in determining present events and, subsequently, may allow for more accurate forecasts/projections concerning the future.

In addition, it was demonstrated that for history to be of use in the public policy-making process, it had to be both accurate and relevant regardless of how it is utilized. It was suggested that history could have one of three uses in the public policy-making process: as general historical data that can be utilized by the policy-maker, as policy relevant historical data or as a tool for analyzing the appropriateness and effectiveness of a specific policy. Any or all of these three areas would make for an interesting study; however, it is this last role - as a tool of analysis - which this study of the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta is based upon.

---

[1] Ernest R. May, "Lessons" of the Past: The Use and Misuse of History in American Foreign Policy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).
Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May, Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers (New York: The Free Press, 1986).

But, how can history be useful in the analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of a policy already in place? History can be used to determine whether a specific policy was appropriate, whether it was effective or whether it was appropriate and effective. Once again, it would be both interesting and useful to explore how history could be used to help determine a specific policy's appropriateness and effectiveness, however, for the purposes of this study, the focus will be limited to how history can help determine the appropriateness of a specific policy. There are two ways in which history can be useful in the process of determining the appropriateness of a specific policy. First, history can be used to determine whether a specific policy was appropriate given the development of the policy problem and the context in which the solution was implemented. Second, it can be used to determine to what extent historical information was used appropriately or misused in the development of the policy and what implications this may have. Thus, what will be discussed in this chapter is a methodology for this type of analysis which can then be applied to the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta.

However, before any specific methodology can be discussed, it is necessary to conclude the discussion on the characteristics of history and their relationship to the public policy-making process because this discussion will serve as the base from which the methodology will come. This means that this chapter will be divided into two major sections which will lay the groundwork for the remainder of the study. The first section, "The Problems of History", will be a continuation of the discussion of the previous chapter on the characteristics of history and their relationship to the public policy-making process. Then in the context of this discussion, based on the previous chapter and the first section of this chapter, the specific methods that will be used in this analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta will be detailed in the next section entitled "The Historian's Methods".

THE PROBLEMS OF HISTORY

In the previous chapter, the nature of history was examined over time to determine what components were essential to history and it was suggested that history needs both accuracy and relevance. Nowhere is this more true than in the public policy-making process. Policy-makers need accurate, relevant historical information which they can use in the decision-making process. Thus, whether the historian is doing policy specific research or more general research, it is necessary to combine accuracy and relevance. However, before the historian can design an appropriate methodology, historiographical problems must be considered. It is these historiographical problems which will now be discussed in order to complete the groundwork for this study's methodology.

For better or worse, the custodians of the past are historians. Of course, there are librarians and archivists who are involved in the preservation of the records of the past; however, it is the historian "who, essentially through the analysis of sources, produces interpretations of the past"[2] which are passed on to the larger society including public policy-makers. This means that historians are involved in a process in which they attempt to uncover the 'facts' and use those 'facts' to explain what happened and why it happened in the past. To accomplish this task, most professional historians use some type of theoretical framework of interpretation from which to go about this process of historical enquiry. Although there are unique characteristics in each framework, there are broader categories that are used to label the type of history being done. For example, many historians focus their framework around one dominant factor such as economics or politics. Other historians attempt to do more comprehensive work examining several important aspects of the subject being researched.[3] The reason for such a variety of approaches to history can be linked to the personal biases and preferences of the historians and even the national and cultural orientations of their societies. That is, historical research is likely to be governed by the assumptions and conventions of the age and society in which the research and reflection take place.

---

[2] Arthur Marwick, The Nature of History (3rd edition) (London: MacMillan Education Ltd., 1989), p. 6.

[3] For example: F. Braudel, On History (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

Just as the use of different frameworks of interpretation applies to the study of economic or political history, so it is true in the field of educational history. The past thirty years has seen the rise of 'revisionist' history in which many historians have used various methods to re-interpret the 'whig' history of education. Prior to the 1960s, the 'whig' interpretation characterized much of educational history. This term stems from Herbert Butterfield's classic critique[4] in which he brought attention to "how some historical accounts are really uncritical testimonials rather than genuinely analytical works."[5] In educational history this meant that only formal education, especially schools,[6] was examined and this examination was done in isolation without taking into account other societal factors which influence education. In addition, the 'whig' interpretation tended to emphasize a continual move towards progress either ignoring or discounting any problems that might have arisen with formal education. However, in the 1960s, there was a shift away from the 'whig' interpretation towards interpretation which revised the methodology of educational history, hence the term 'revisionist' history.

---

[4] Herbert Butterfield, The Whig Interpretation of History (New York: W.W. Norton, 1965). Originally published in 1931.

[5] Kas Mazurek, "Interpreting Educational History - With A Commentary on the Social Context of Early Public Schooling" in Essays on Canadian Education edited by Nick Kach, Kas Mazurek, Robert S. Patterson and Ivan DeFaveri (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1986), p. 24.

[6] F. Henry Johnson, A Brief History of Canadian Education (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Company of Canada Limited, 1968).

This shift was led by Bernard Bailyn[7] and was centered on a re-interpretation of educational history which involved the consideration of the effect of other societal factors on education. The result of the work of Bailyn and others was to give more credibility to educational history and place it within the mainstream of historical enquiry as part of 'social' history. In social history, society is viewed as a place where a variety of social forces and institutions interact; thus, the school is only one such institution. However, this was only the first step in 'revisionist' history for it was not practical for educational historians to write histories which could be all-encompassing. It was obvious that priorities had to be determined and this gave rise to two different groups: the 'radical revisionists' and the 'moderate revisionists'.

The 'radical revisionists'[8] stressed the class-biased, racist and bureaucratic nature of schooling and "focused upon class structure, concentrations of political and economic power, the cultural and material interests of dominant groups, and any threats to the status quo which may emerge."[9] This is the opposite to the 'whig' interpretation and is often seen as being a type of neo-

---

[7] Bernard Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press and New York: W.W. Norton, 1960).

[8] For example: Michael Katz, School Reform: Past and Present (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971).

[9] Mazurek, op. cit., p, 26.

Marxist approach based on the notion of social control. On the other hand, the 'moderate revisionists' do not concentrate on the notion of social control "rather they consider a much broader social context of influences upon public schooling."[10] They recognize the influence of government, community organizations and individuals on education and attempt to develop an understanding of the past based on the past not the present. "While they readily acknowledge flaws in and alternatives to the educational systems they remain sympathetic to those systems."[11] Thus, there are three major frameworks for the educational historian to choose from, namely, the two directions in 'revisionist' history as well as the 'whig' interpretation. Although the 'radical revisionist' approach has proven to be invaluable because it has sparked "the critical analysis of social regulation and an appreciation of the interrelatedness (as well as the pervasiveness) of efforts to structure aspects of behaviour of different social groups,"[12] there are limitations to this approach due, in part, to the diverse purposes that are part of any public policy. The notion of social control, while undoubtedly important, is only one of the factors that may enter into any educational policy; thus, it is vital that any study of an educational policy be done with a broader context in mind. This being the case, for the purposes of this study, the overriding approach will be that of the 'moderate revisionist'. What does this mean? It means that if there are elements of social control and reproduction that do exist in relation to the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta then they will be examined; however, the existence of other more positive elements will also be acknowledged and examined. As well, the choice of this framework means that the existence of problems, such as operational or philosophical problems, associated with the policy will not be ignored or excluded from consideration. Of course, historians who fall into this broad category of 'moderate revisionism' each have their own specific methods; nevertheless, this study will be generally sympathetic to the educational system of Alberta while acknowledging the existence of flaws in and alternatives to the system.

---

[10] Ibid.

[11] J.S. Hardy, "A Review of Selected Materials in the Educational History of Western Canada: Opportunities for Further Research" in The Journal of Educational Thought, Vol. 14, No. 2, 1980, p. 65.

[12] Susan E. Houston and Alison Prentice, Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth Century Ontario (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), p. xi.

Regardless of the specific approach taken, historians must develop an approach that makes clear the assumptions and methods that are involved. As historians make these decisions the question of objectivity enters into the process. "It is frequently argued that written history can never be objective; even if the personal bias of the historian can be overcome (which many doubt), it is still inevitable that what is written must be relative to the tastes, customs and prejudices of the creative moment."[13] Thus, an important question which needs to be answered is: Is it possible to make decisions, to select methods and sources without the historian's personal biases and preferences affecting the outcomes?

---

[13] Ibid., p. 329.

In the past this question, like the question concerning accuracy and relevance, has divided the history community into two general camps. Although discussion of these two camps will be somewhat repetitious, it is important to discuss the two perspectives before any conclusions can be made. Historians like Hempel and Ranke would argue that it is possible for the historian to be divorced from personal biases and preferences.[14] That is, it is possible for the historian to become a dispassionate, objective, minute analyst of the past.[15] Historians who promote this position look to the 'hard' sciences for their example of the notion of objectivity. It has been held for a long time that the nature of scientific knowledge has been objective. That is, regardless of which scientist conducted the experiments or tests, all would come to the same conclusions.[16] Yet this notion of science has undergone change recently.[17] It is now commonly held that science is 'provisional' knowledge, that is, it is open to new or modified conclusions.[18] The scientist will make a hypothesis and attempt to prove or refute it; however, in doing this, there is a need to select 'relevant' facts/data. Thus, it can be argued that even in the 'hard' sciences there is only limited objectivity.

---

[14] Carl Hempel, "The Function of General Laws in History" in Theories of History edited by Patrick Gardiner (New York: The Free Press, 1959), pp. 344-355.
Gordon Connell-Smith and Howell A. Lloyd, The Relevance of History (London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1972), p. 19f.

[15] Connell-Smith and Lloyd, op. cit., p. 33.

[16] John Tosh, The Pursuit of History (London: Longman Group UK Limited, 1984), p. 109.

[17] For example, Thomas Kuhn put forward the notion of 'scientific revolution' as the basis for scientific advancement. However, this view is no longer accepted because it implies total breaks with the past, scientific progress is viewed as a more incremental progression involving new hypotheses or theories.
Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolution (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970), pp. 1-7.

[18] Bryan Magee, Karl Popper (New York: Viking Press, 1973).

Other historians such Collingwood would argue that the historian must become the person being studied or at least a participant of the event or era being studied.[19] According to Collingwood, the historian's success can be measured by whether the reader also becomes a participant and this will demonstrate whether the historian has eliminated subjectivity.[20] Although this is an interesting approach, it does not seem possible to separate oneself from that which makes a person an unique individual - personality, upbringing, culture and so on. Thus, it would seem that there still exists some degree of subjectivity on the part of the historian.

Historians such as Hempel, Ranke and Collingwood believe that it is possible for the historian to be objective. However, there are other historians such as Carr who strongly disagree with this notion and believe that "the belief in a hard core of historical facts existing objectively and independently of the interpretation of the historian is a preposterous fallacy."[21] The historian cannot be divorced from personal biases and prejudices. "The harsh fact of life is that, willy-nilly, the present-day historian lives not in the past but in the present, and this fact cannot be altered by any pious resolve to be history-minded."[22] Thus, there are historians who believe that it is possible for the historian to be objective and others who believe this is not possible. So, which group of historians is correct?

---

[19] R.G. Collingwood, The Idea of History (London: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 282.

[20] Ibid., p. 282f.

[21] E.H. Carr, What is History? (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1961), p. 6.

The response would seem to be that none of them are absolutely correct, that is, there can only be limited objectivity. Although there is less doubt in the natural sciences, there is still the opportunity to come to new or modified conclusions. In history there is much more doubt in the area of what is known. "Historians venture hypotheses, explain the data they assemble, and offer generalizations aimed at rendering the interrelation among those data more intelligible."[23] It is important to recognize that historians are involved in a process that requires decisions and selection. John Tosh believes that "the essence of historical enquiry is selection - of 'relevant' sources, of 'historical' facts and of 'significant' interpretation."[24] It is not possible for the historian to use every piece of information or every source available in the research being done. Thus, regardless of the approach taken, "every written history . . . is a selection and arrangement of facts . . . an act of choice, conviction and interpretation."[25] This means that historical research/writing reflects a much wider range of assumptions, beliefs and values of not only the historian, but also the audience for whom the history was written.

---

[22] J.H. Hexter, Reappraisals in History: New Views on History and Society in Early Modern Europe (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979), p. 3.

[23] J.H. Hexter, Doing History (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1971), p. 140.

[24] Tosh, op. cit., p. 117.

All historians have their own set of assumptions, beliefs and values. What the historian brings to the historical enquiry process has been developed over the course of the individual's life. It has been learnt from parents and other role models (e.g. teachers) as well as having been chosen by the historian. Thus, since it is historians who are involved in historical enquiry and they are not able to be completely objective, historical enquiry is, at least to some degree, subjective. This is not necessarily a problem, but it is important to remember that all historians select the sources to be used and the way in which they are used. This will not lead to a general consensus concerning any part of the past; however, it will lead to the exploration of many different facets of the past. And this can be beneficial because each historian may be able to offer another insight into the past. With many different insights into the past, it may be possible to piece together a more complete picture of what actually happened. Of course, nothing will be absolute and all will be open to re-examination and re-interpretation; however, the many different insights will assist people, especially public policy-makers, to better understand the past and thus, to better understand and control the present. It is here that this study, which is not the final word but instead is a first attempt to combine general principles of historical research with specific techniques in the analysis of a major public policy in Alberta, fits in.

---

[25] William Dray, Philosophy of History (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 27.

Historians need to scrutinize their own assumptions, beliefs and values to see how they relate to their enquiry.[26] They also need to use an explicit hypothesis that can be tested and they must put their work in the proper historical context.[27] Perhaps the most difficult of these tasks is the scrutiny of one's own assumptions, beliefs and values. This will require the historian to take part in some self-examination and reflection; however, once historians become aware of the assumptions, beliefs and values that help govern their lives, they will be able to ascertain what impact these may have on their research. For example, it has been a long held assumption on the part of some historians who specialize in the education of Western Canada, and particularly historians of Ukrainian descent,[28] that the Government of Alberta made the use of languages other than English in schools illegal in 1913; however, upon close scrutiny of the Statutes of Alberta it can be shown that this is simply not true (this will be discussed further in chapter four). What this example demonstrates is that historians can better ensure 'limited objectivity' if they scrutinize their own assumptions, beliefs and values.

---

[26] Tosh, op. cit., p. 124.

[27] Ibid.

[28] For example: W.A. Czumer, Recollections About the Life of the First Ukrainian Settlers in Canada (Edmonton: The Printing Services, University of Alberta, 1981); and Nick Kach, Professor of Educational Foundations, University of Alberta. Interview at the University of Alberta, March 1991.

If historians discover that it is too difficult to separate this part of themselves from their work, then they should inform their audience/ readership of this. This will not necessarily take anything away from the work, but it will assist the reader in understanding "where the historian is coming from" and why the facts/data were selected as they were. However, if historians can minimize the influence of their assumptions, beliefs and values then there is no need to bring them to the readers' attention. Regardless of which option historians choose, it can only be done if they are aware of the assumptions, beliefs and values that influence them.

Even though there may be instances when historians are more objective, it would seem that with the selection of facts/data comes subjectivity. If historians are aware of this then they can keep it to a minimum, but will not be able to eliminate it. A second way for historians to minimize subjectivity is by using an explicit hypothesis that can be tested.[29] Now this hypothesis can take the form of stated or implied questions to which historians provide answers or it may simply be a statement of what is being researched and written about. Regardless of which form the hypothesis takes, historians can continually reflect to see whether the questions or statement of intent are being followed. This will provide historians with a benchmark to help direct their research and writing. Thus, for this study, the major hypothesis is: To what extent and in what ways was history used by the policy-makers in the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta.

---

[29] Tosh, op. cit., p. 124.

The third way that historians can reduce subjectivity is to place their work in the proper historical context.[30] That is, research of a particular event or era should not be done in a historical vacuum. Determining how the specific event or era fits into the larger continuum of history will assist historians in understanding its proper significance. As well, an examination of how a particular event or era fits in will assist historians in understanding why something happened as it did. Part of this process of determining how something or someone fits into the larger continuum of history is to explore the reactions to a specific event or era. Nothing just happens. There are causes and effects for all historical occurrences even the most minor. Placing one's research in the larger continuum of history will be an additional check to assist historians in minimizing subjectivity in their work. Thus, for this study, it is important to consider other factors, such as the federal government's policy of multiculturalism, in order to place the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta in the proper historical context. This will be done in the next chapter which will explore federal immigration policy, the development of the federal policy of multiculturalism and the change in the language of instruction policies of the Government of Alberta.

It should now be somewhat clear that historians are human beings who happen to be very interested in the past. As human beings all historians have their own set of assumptions, beliefs and values. As a result of this, the study of history can only have limited objectivity. Part of the task that historians are faced with is to minimize the influence of their own subjectivity in the selection of what sources to use and how to use them. Nonetheless, the avid student of history (as all public policy-makers should be) will recognize that subjectivity enters not only as historians select their sources, determine the facts/data to include and propose interpretations, but it also enters in as the readers' assumptions, beliefs and values influence how they react and interpret what historians have written on a specific topic.

---

[30] Ibid.

So, what does this mean? Does it mean that history, because of its limited objective nature, has nothing to offer? No! This should simply serve as a warning for historians and public policy-makers alike as they enter into the study of humankind in the past. Of course, this is true for this study on the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta which means that the choosing of specific methods for the analysis must meet the criterion laid down, namely, it needs to promote accuracy, objectivity and relevance. Keeping this warning in mind, how should the historian proceed to determine the appropriateness of a specific policy?

THE HISTORIAN'S METHODS

Given the warning concerning the limited objective nature of historical enquiry, it is now appropriate to turn the discussion back to how the historian should go about determining the appropriateness of a specific policy. In the introduction to this chapter it was suggested that history could be used in two ways to help determine the appropriateness of a specific policy. First, to determine whether the policy was appropriate given the development of the policy problem and the context in which the solution was implemented. Second, to determine the extent to which historical information was used appropriately or misused in the development of the policy and what implications this may have. What is the methodology behind each of these?

The first use of history will require tracing the policy problem over time to see how it developed and to determine what the present problem actually is. Of course, this is predicated on the assumption that the past policy problem has contemporary relevance and this is the assumption concerning the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta. Whether it is a new initiative or a current problem both need historical analysis because there may be a need for further analysis or development of the policy. Thus, by tracing the development of the Heritage Language Policy, it will be possible to place the policy problem in the broader historical context in which the solution was implemented. These tasks can be fulfilled by following some of the general historical principles previously discussed, namely, that the historian needs to be aware and reduce the influence of subjectivity in the research process, to explicitly state what the research will demonstrate and to be sure to broaden the scope of the research to clearly deal with the development of the policy problem and its solution within the broader historical context. Of course, of paramount importance for this type of historical enquiry is that the historian adheres to the canons of general historical scholarship with accuracy and relevance as guiding principles. However, it is also vital to keep in mind that the work is not being done for other professional historians, but for public policy-makers. This means that it needs to be communicated in a way that is intelligible for the non-historian which means that clarity is of great importance. The historian must attempt to keep to the point and order the material with clarity. Thus, it is in the historian's best interests to combine fluid and concise writing skills with a keen eye for detail.

In order to achieve this historians must be clear and consistent concerning the sources to be used and how those sources are to be used.[31] Historians must ask themselves questions such as where are the sources and how should they be used. In history there is much doubt in the area of what is known - what the facts are - because of the subjectivity involved in the selection of sources and how significant facts are determined.

Although the raw material for historical enquiry seems to be almost limitless, the historian's chief concern should be with original and contemporary sources[32] which will be referred to as primary sources. Of these sources there are those that are written with posterity in mind and those that are written with no thought of posterity. Sources that are written for posterity such as government records or personal memoirs have certain limitations because they tend to record or recount only what the author thought was worth noting as well as being used, at times, to put individuals in a better light to be remembered by. Although such sources have limitations, they are still very important. The sources that are written with less thought of posterity such as newspapers or private correspondence provide a better source for historians. Yet no matter what the primary source, there are limitations due to the fact that the information will be limited and what was written was selected by the author; thus, the sources require scrutiny. As was mentioned in the first chapter, the primary sources that will be used in this study include government documents such as the Statutes of Alberta, Departmental Regulations and Annual Reports. All of these sources have been carefully scrutinized because the motivations of the policy-makers are not revealed in official government documents and they, like other people, have biases that may effect what they write.

---

[31] Ibid., p. 48f.

[32] V.H. Galbraith, An Introduction to the Study of History (London: C.A. Watts & Co., 1964), p. 14.

Of course, there are other types of primary sources such as oral testimonies, material artifacts, pictures, photographs and so on which can be used by historians.[33] Each of these sources has its limitations, but if properly used, they provide historians with useful information and insights. It is important to note that the amount of primary source material available will vary depending upon the historical event or era being examined. Nevertheless, historians are forced to select from the total information available to them and, regardless of how historians may explain their choices, there invariably are personal factors involved.[34] Thus, the historian should follow some of the guidelines previously discussed in order to be as objective as possible.

---

[33] Marwick, op. cit., pp. 208-210.

Up to this point, the discussion on historical enquiry has focused on the historian using primary sources to develop an understanding of the past. It is worth noting that there is a second type of historical enquiry which involves the use of secondary sources. It is possible, and in the public policy-making process highly likely, that a more effective way to establish an understanding of the past as it pertains to a specific policy is to use secondary sources. Although this requires reliance on other historians, it is necessary, in large part, because time constraints associated with the public policy-making process do not always allow for original research. Thus, what is needed is to have a qualified individual - an historian - proceed to review current and past research in the areas that might have some impact on the specific policy and then proceed to produce a summary of that research which would certainly contain interpretations and judgements concerning what should be considered significant. Although May argues that it really only needs to be a policy analyst who is "sensitive to the variety and complexity of the past, the tentativeness of most historical reconstructions, and the many hazards associated with claiming one occurrence is 'like' another,"[35] an historian is needed because of the complexity of sorting out the historical data and interpretations. But more importantly, it may be necessary to do research with selected primary sources when there is a vagueness in the secondary sources or when there is a danger of the secondary sources having been written for advocacy purposes or by those who hold the belief that history is written by the victor. The summary could then be used to provide the background information in the development of the problem and its solution. Thus, the individual would need to follow similar guidelines as the historian who was working with primary sources in order to reduce the subjective nature of this work.

---

[34] Christopher Blake, "Can History Be Objective?" in Theories of History edited by Patrick Gardiner (New York: The Free Press, 1959), p. 330.

[35] May, op. cit., p. xiii.

In using secondary sources - most often, the findings of other historians who have explored the topic(s) of interest - the individual needs to be cautious and critical of the sources used. Since the individual would not examine the original sources, the review done would need to include a comparison of several historical studies. Although original research is preferred, this type of research would bring to the public policy-making process the historical explanations of the policy problem and its solution. Thus, this means that for this study, "An Analysis of Alberta's Heritage Language Policy, 1971", it will be necessary to place the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta into the broader historical context of the language of instruction policies of Alberta and the federal policy of multiculturalism which will be discussed in the next chapter. Both primary and secondary sources will be used in this portion of the study, so that, an understanding of these policies can be obtained.

This is important because it is these policies which, in part, influenced the Government of Alberta to develop the Heritage Language Policy.

The development of the federal policy of multiculturalism, which will be examined in the next chapter, will place the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta in the necessary broader historical context and will begin to show whether the provincial policy was appropriate. However, to more fully answer the question of whether the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta was an appropriate policy, it will be necessary to examine to what extent historical information was used appropriately or misused in the development of the policy and then to discuss what the implications may be. The approach that will be used will be based in large part on the work of Harvard University professors, Richard Neustadt and Ernest May, who have done pioneer work in the field of the use of history in public policy-making.

As stated previously, Neustadt and May argue that policy-makers use history in the public policy-making process whether they know so or not. That is, most public policy-makers work from either an ahistorical or an incorrect historical perspective. There are some policy-makers who do not see any importance in what has gone before and thus, do not see a role for history in the public policy-making process. These policy-makers begin as if the policy problem began only yesterday and miss out on its development and what has been tried before. Not only would history be useful to give the policy-makers much needed information, it could also give them a new perspective on the present by demonstrating that structures and situations simply do not develop overnight but usually have deep historical roots. The number of policy-makers who could be classified in this group as ahistorical are few; thus, Neustadt and May focus on the majority of policy-makers who use history in the public policy-making process, but do so badly.

How do these public policy-makers use history badly? They are "influenced by beliefs about what history teaches or portends"[36] not what actually happened in the past. That is, they use what they believe to be history to form analogies and/or parallels between the past and the present and from these incorrect analogies and/or parallels they envision the future.[37] Thus, it can be said that they use history badly. May, based on his study on the use and misuse of history in American foreign policy, summed up how public policy-makers use history:

> When resorting to analogy, they tend to seize upon the first that comes to mind. They do not search more widely. Nor do they pause to analyze the case, test its fitness, or even ask in what ways it might be misleading. Seeing a trend running toward the present they tend to assume that it will continue into the future, not stopping to consider what produced it or why a linear projection might prove to be mistaken.[38]

---

[36] Ibid., p. ix.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid., p. xi.

These practices cause policy-makers to misunderstand problems or trends and make unfounded assumptions about trends continuing into the future. Thus, a more discriminating use of history "might help people who must make choices or must estimate the future to free themselves from the analogies, parallels, or trend-readings which they might otherwise unthinkingly apply."[39]

Thus, after placing the policy problem and its solution in the broader historical context, it will then be necessary to determine whether and how the policy-makers used history in the policy-making process. These two steps will combine to help establish the appropriateness of the policy. But, how does one determine the policy-maker's use of history and whether it was appropriate? It is here that Neustadt and May's "mini-methods"[40] will be adapted to help determine the uses and misuses of history and whether they were appropriate.

NEUSTADT AND MAY'S METHODS

Before going further it would seem appropriate to give some much needed background on Neustadt and May's ideas. As mentioned previously, both these men are faculty members at Harvard University at the John F. Kennedy School of Government and thus, one of their primary concerns is in training individuals who will be involved in the public policy-making process. In fact, their interest in the uses of history in the public policy-making process is centered on how history can help policy-makers make better decisions. They do not make any grandiose claims, but rather argue for marginal improvements in a process in which decisions are situational and decision-makers are constrained by time. Thus, they use the term "mini-methods" to refer to some specific methods which policy-makers can use in order to enhance their decisions. In order to test their "mini-methods" Neustadt and May provide case study examples of American macropolicy - both domestic and foreign policy which dealt with issues on a national or international scale - which demonstrate how their "mini-methods" could have assisted the policy-makers involved to improve their decisions.

---

[39] Ibid., p. xiii.

[40] Neustadt and May, op. cit., pp. 273-275.

Indeed Neustadt and May are quite correct to talk about "marginal improvements"[41] in the public policy-making process because this process involves several disciplines and a multitude of factors and interest groups. It would be naive to believe that the proper use of history would usually bring about dramatic changes in the public policy-making process; nevertheless, the proper use of history can bring, at least, marginal improvements. Thus, Neustadt and May's ideas and methods are one approach to the proper use of history yet their methods need to be adapted for two reasons. First, this study is not a macropolicy, but rather a micropolicy centering on education in Alberta. Second, Neustadt and May's methods cannot be applied to all policy problems; thus, only some methods, which will be called "techniques", will be applied to the analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta.

---

[41] Ibid., pp. xvii.

The first step in determining whether the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta used history in the process was to develop the "Modified Neustadt and May Techniques" (hereafter referred to as the "Modified Techniques") and then use these techniques in the analysis. In order to accomplish this, it was first necessary to choose and explain the "mini-methods" of Neustadt and May which were to be adapted. Second, a description of these adapted "mini-methods" now called the "Modified Techniques" along with an accompanying explanation on how these techniques were to be used was required.

To begin the process, it is necessary to explain Neustadt and May's "mini-methods" and how they were turned into the "Modified Techniques". The overriding goal for Neustadt and May is to help policy-makers more clearly define their concerns and objectives in a given policy area. By doing this, history will have made the public policy-making process better and marginal improvement of the process will have been realized.[42] Thus, Neustadt and May's "mini-methods" were designed to help policy-makers to more clearly define their concerns and objectives. In Thinking in Time, Neustadt and May offer policy-makers seven "mini-methods" to improve their decision-making by helping them more clearly define their concerns and objectives. Appendix B offers a thumb nail sketch of these

---

[42] Ibid., p. 240.

"mini-methods" and it is taken directly from their book. However, not all seven "mini-methods" were appropriate for adaptation into the "Modified Techniques". Figure 1 shows the sequence of the Neustadt and May's "mini-methods" which were chosen for adaptation into the "Modified Techniques".

FIGURE 1: The Sequence of Neustadt and May's "Mini-methods"

1. "Known-Unclear-Presumed/Likenesses-Differences"
2. "Placement"
3. "Issue History"
    a) the Goldberg Rule
    b) Journalists' questions
    c) Time-lines

GOAL: To clarify the policy-makers' concerns and objectives
PROCEDURE: Begin with "Known-Unclear-Presumed/Likeneses-Differences" and if necessary move to "Placement" and if necessary move to "Issue History".
THIS SEQUENCE IS TO BE USED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SPECIFIC POLICY.

What follows is a more detailed description of the "mini-methods" which were adapted to become the "Modified Techniques".

The first "mini-method" that was adapted was the "Known-Unclear-Presumed/Likenesses-Differences" method (referred to as the "K-U-P/L-D" method).[43] This "mini-method" was designed to help policy-makers define the immediate situation and their concerns and objectives. The first step for the policy-maker is to separate what is Known from what is Unclear and both from what is Presumed in the immediate situation and any analogies and/or parallels that come to the policy-maker.[44] What is involved here is the analysis of the immediate situation in order that objectives can be better drawn. However, once the immediate situation and any analogies/parallels have been clarified, there is one other step that is necessary to ensure the proper use of analogies/parallels. The second step is to compare the immediate situation and the analogies/parallels for Likenesses and Differences.[45] This step will help determine whether, or to what extent, the analogies/parallels can be used to help clarify the problem and set forth objectives. Thus, these two steps would assist the policy-maker not to make any assumptions about what the problem is, but rather to clarify the problem and determine whether the past can offer any insight into the problem or potential solutions.

---

[43] Ibid., p. 273.

[44] Ibid., p. 37.

An example from Neustadt and May illustrates how this process can help in the evaluation of the appropriateness of a policy. In 1976 there was a great deal of concern in the United States over the possible outbreak of a swine flu epidemic. The concern arose from the 'folk' history which surrounded the Influenza epidemic of 1918 where a half million Americans died. The policy-makers, especially President Ford and his senior advisors, were captivated by the analogy of 1918. The officials of the Public Health Service did not advise Ford of the differences between the two situations and thus, Ford and his senior advisors drew a parallel between 1918 and 1976 with the result being a hastily conceived vaccination plan which had numerous problems and setbacks. What Neustadt and May argue is that if the 'captivating' analogy had been challenged, that is, more closely examined and clarified then Ford might not have authorized such an ill-conceived vaccination plan.[46]

---

[45] Ibid., p. 41.

It is important to point out that Neustadt and May identified three major types of analogies that will help in analysis if the specific type of analogy involved can be identified. The three major types of analogies are: irresistible, captivating and seductive.[47] Each of these analogies require specific attention and can further assist in determining whether history was properly used. Irresistible analogies are those analogies that come to mind immediately and seem to be history repeating itself.[48] For example, the invasion of South Korea in 1950 brought the events of the 1930s in Europe to President Truman's mind.[49] These types of analogies need a closer look to illuminate concerns and options. Captivating analogies, such as the 1976 swine flu concern, are influenced by emotional ties/recollections. They need to be reviewed for the same reason as the irresistible analogies, but also to uncover questionable presumptions which have been presented as facts.[50] Seductive analogies are those which involve emotions such as fear and anger that can rule out analysis for immediate action. The capture of the Mayaguez, a forty-year-old American cargo freighter, in 1975 brought immediately to the minds of President Ford and his senior advisors the capture of the Pueblo, an American intelligence ship, in 1968. Of course, there were important differences such as the United States was no longer at war in 1975; however, the emotions that this analogy conjured up influenced Ford into a hastily planned rescue mission.[51] If President Ford and his advisors had re-examined the situation instead of being led by the emotions surrounding the analogy, it is possible that the rescue mission would have been reconsidered. Thus, as a general rule, these types of analogies need to be re-examined to make sure that the problem has not changed before action is taken.[52] There are, of course, other types of analogies; however, these three categories will suffice to help determine whether analogies were used appropriately and if not, what effects their misuse may have had on the Heritage Language Policy.

---

[46] Ibid., pp. 48-56.

[47] Ibid., p. 66.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid., pp. 34-48.

[50] Ibid., p. 66.

The second "mini-method", which can be used to help determine whether and how history was used, is really a group of three methods which Neustadt and May call "issue history".[53] Once again, Neustadt and May offer "mini-methods" to the policy-maker in order to do "issue history", that is, they argue that if their "mini-methods" are followed and used together, they will help the policy-maker to "trace and articulate the history of the issue (the issue is defined by the decision-maker's concerns), for more light on objectives, thence options" for action.[54] As with the first "mini-method", the "K-U-P/L-D" method, a basic understanding is necessary before it can be adapted for use in this study.

---

[51] Ibid., pp. 58-66.

[52] Ibid., p. 66.

[53] Ibid., p. 274.

Neustadt and May argue that "[s]ince problems or concerns often arise because of some real or apparent change in a situation previously ignored or tolerated, a brief scan backward ought to be standard practice."[55] It is vital that policy-makers see history as a flow of time and see that problems develop over time not suddenly. It is not possible for policy-makers to learn all the details in the time available to them. "The trick is to hit upon a useful combination of key trends and key particulars selected by the light of well-defined concerns"[56] which the first technique should provide. Thus, Neustadt and May suggest three "mini-methods" to be used to trace and articulate the history of the issue, namely: "the Goldberg Rule", "Time-lines" and "Journalists' questions".[57] They are closely linked and need to be used together because issue history "is not a string of analogues or precedents; rather it is a series of connected happenings, which over time take on the form of trends."[58]

---

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid., p. 96.

[56] Ibid., p. 132.

[57] Ibid., p. 274.

[58] Ibid., p. 131.

The Goldberg Rule[59] should begin the process of doing "issue history". Most often policy-makers plunge into action without finding out what the problem really is. Instead of asking the question 'what's the story?', they ask 'what's the problem?'; however, in order to more fully understand what the problem really is, it is necessary to understand the development of the problem.[60] In fact, Neustadt and May argue that unless one starts with the question - "what's the story?" - there will be a distorted understanding of what the problem really is.

In connection with what question is asked is "the associated principle that the story should always be taken back to its beginning [because] this reduces the chances of storytelling warped by advocacy."[61]. This principle finds an outlet in the use of time-lines. It is simply an attempt to plot on an easily readable graph the major events and trends that have influenced the development of the problem (issue). Thus, not only will policy-makers have the story, but they will have the key particulars and trends in easily accessible form. However, the third "mini-method" will bring additional clarity to the history of the issue. Neustadt and May suggest the use of journalists' questions will sharpen the story. Already the questions "what" and "when" have been asked. Now the other journalists' questions -"where", "who", "how" and "why"- should be asked.

---

[59] The Goldberg Rule is named after Avram Goldberg who happens to be the chief executive officer of Stop and Shop, a New England chain of grocery and discount department stores. Goldberg told Neustadt and May that he does not ask his managers 'what's the problem', but rather 'what's the story'.
Ibid., p. 106.

[60] Ibid., p. 274.

[61] Ibid., p. 133.

In order to effectively do "issue history", Neustadt and May suggest that policy-makers do the following: invoke the Goldberg Rule, plot the relevant trends on the time-line and then plot any changes in specifics on the time-line, especially the ones that appear to be of high political significance.[62] Then the policy-makers can, if necessary, re-articulate their objectives and options to match their concerns as redefined by issue history.[63]

Here again, an example from Neustadt and May illustrates how this process can help in the evaluation of the appropriateness of a policy. In 1977 President Carter wanted to conclude and sign a Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT Treaty) with the Soviet Union. His primary concern was over the increase in both American and Soviet forces and how the defense budget could be better spent; however, he and his senior advisors did not understand the history of the issue. Thus, when he sent his Secretary of State to Moscow with new demands for much deeper cuts, it was a surprise to the Administration when failure resulted. What Neustadt and May argue is that Carter needed to better understand the issue. If Carter or his staff had taken the time, they would have realized that the issue was not simply arms reduction, but how this related to defense spending and the history of American-Soviet negotiations. Carter would have realized that the Soviets had never done anything except increase their strategic forces. This information might have led Carter to the conclusion that, instead of demanding greater cuts, he should simply sign the Treaty and then begin another round of negotiations. However, without fully understanding the issue, Carter pressed for deep cuts and came away with nothing.[64] Again, "issue history" will not perfect public policy-making, but it will/can give policy-makers additional opportunity to refine their concerns and thus, their objectives and options.

---

[62] Ibid., p. 274.

[63] Ibid.

The final "mini-method" to be used is what Neustadt and May call "placement".[65] Basically what they argue is that policy-makers need "to anticipate and take into account the different ways in which different actors see the world and their roles in it."[66] In fact, it is commonplace for policy-makers do this; however, this anticipation is often based on a primitive stereotype about the individual, group and/or organization. Thus, what "placement" can do is to improve or sophisticate one's stereotypes which will in turn improve the accuracy of the policy-maker's 'guesses' concerning the influence and concerns of the other significant players in the process.[67]

Thus, what "placement" is designed to do is to help the policy-makers examine their stereotypes of the other significant players involved in the public policy-making process. This examination should center around 'placing' the individual, group and/or organization in a broader historical context. That is, using "historical information to enrich initial stereotypes about another person's outlook - "sophisticating" stereotypes in the sense of adding facets or perspectives or at least shadings to what otherwise are very crude conjectures."[68] How is this done?

---

[64] Ibid., pp. 111-131.

[65] Ibid., p. 275.

[66] Ibid., p. 157.

[67] Ibid., p. 159.

What policy-makers should do is to first identify the stereotype(s) that they have about specific individuals, groups and/or organizations and then proceed to 'place' them. This is done by laying out the relevant time-line of the life of the individual, group or organization and then plotting the relevant events and details.[69] Relevant events are those events which are a matter of public record and could have influenced the development of the individual, group or organization.[70] For example, the significant economic or political developments of an era may give an important insight into an individual's worldview. On the other hand, relevant details are significant details of a personal nature which are not a matter of public knowledge, but can easily be found.[71] For example, the place an individual was raised or educated may give an important insight into that individual. Once the significant events and details have been laid out on the time-line, it will then be possible for the policy-maker to "draw inferences about the person's likely outlook or the organization's likely approach in order to sophisticate initial stereotypes."[72]

---

[68] Ibid.

[69] Ibid., p. 275.

[70] Ibid., p. 158.

[71] Ibid., pp. 165-166.

Once again, an example from Neustadt and May illustrates how "placement" can help in the evaluation of the appropriateness of a policy. In the early 1960s, the Americans were developing several new weapons systems - one of which was the Skybolt missile. President Eisenhower promised this missile to the British in order to encourage the continuation of the British nuclear deterrent; however, when Kennedy took office, it was determined that the Skybolt was too expensive and inefficient. Instead of informing the British, the American administration unilaterally cancelled the Skybolt with disastrous implications for Anglo-American relations. The Americans did not consider why the Skybolt was so important to the British; however, Neustadt and May argue that if the American Administration had 'placed' Prime Minister Macmillan to determine how much political capital had been spent for the British nuclear deterrent then the Administration's approach would have been different.[73]

Neustadt and May acknowledge that "placement" has limitations. Events can be misread, personal records can have errors or gaps and inferences can only be seen as hypotheses;[74] however, even if it only improves policy-makers' guesses then it is well worth the effort. It is important to remember that placement's "only purpose is to produce a better working guess, a more sophisticated conjecture; the result is still a guess - a hypothesis - and it may be wrong."[75] Nevertheless, it can give policy-makers another technique to improve the accuracy of their decisions.

---

[72] Ibid., p. 275.

[73] Ibid., pp. 190-195.

[74] Ibid., p. 181.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE "MODIFIED TECHNIQUES"

Neustadt and May argue that policy-makers can more clearly define their concerns and objectives with or without the use of history (the past); however, since most policy-makers use history or what they think to be history it becomes clear that the proper use of history has a role to play in more clearly defining the concerns and objectives of policy-makers. Thus, the above "mini-methods" were adapted into the "Modified Techniques" to be used in this analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta. Below Figure 2 outlines the "Modified Techniques".

FIGURE 2: The Sequence of the "Modified Techniques"

1. "Known-Unclear-Presumed/Likenesses-Differences"
2. "Issue History"
3. "Placement"

GOAL: To determine whether policy-makers used any or all of these techniques in the decision-making process.

PROCEDURE: In policy analysis, the three techniques can be used in any sequence. However, in policy development, the three techniques should be used in the above sequence.

THIS SEQUENCE CAN BE USED IN THE ANALYSIS OR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SPECIFIC POLICY.

---

[75] Ibid., p. 211.

What follows is a more detailed description of the "Modified Techniques".

To begin the process of determining whether the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta used history in the process, it is important to discover whether the policy-makers used history when they defined the immediate situation, their concerns in it and set their objectives. As May commented, one of the ways that history is used is in the form of analogies and/or parallels; thus, the first task is to determine whether the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy used analogies and/or parallels to clarify their problem and hence the objectives involved.

Once this has been determined then it is crucial to determine whether these analogies and/or parallels were used appropriately. Neustadt and May have developed "mini-method" called "K-U-P/L-D" which policy-makers are to use to help them properly use analogies and/or parallels; however, for this study, this "mini-method" will be adapted in order to demonstrate whether the policy-makers did use analogies and/or parallels appropriately in the development of the Heritage Language Policy.

The "K-U-P/L-D" technique can help determine whether there are any analogies which can lead to parallels that can be drawn from the past and if there are then it can help to use them appropriately. This is crucial because analogies can/are used for advocacy and it is important not to be caught in a factual error. As well, it is possible that the policy-makers may find some past experience(s) which support their case for present action. Thus, for this study, the first step is to determine whether analogies/parallels were used by the policy-makers to determine the problem and what their concerns should be. If this proves to be the case then the next step is to discover if the policy-makers clarified the immediate situation and any analogies/parallels by determining what was Known, Unclear and Presumed about both. The next step is to discover if the policy-makers compared their analogies with the immediate situation to determine whether the analogies were used appropriately or whether they were misused and led to a misunderstanding of the immediate situation and a misreading of future trends.

Thus, by applying this technique - determining whether and how analogies were used in the development of the Heritage Language Policy - it will be possible to begin to determine the appropriateness of the policy. However, there are two other techniques that can be used to further determine whether and how history was used in the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta and whether the policy was an appropriate response to the immediate situation.

The second "mini-method" that was adapted was "issue history", that is, the combination of the Goldberg Rule, Time-lines and Journalists' questions. Of course, "issue history" will not perfect public policy-making, but it will/can give policy-makers additional opportunity to refine their concerns and thus, their objectives and options. Thus, for this study, this second technique was adapted, so that, what was examined was whether the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Programs used these or other techniques to produce an issue history

- an understanding of the development of the policy problem - to help them refine their concerns and thus, their objectives and options. It is not essential that the policy-makers involved in the Heritage Language Policy used any or all of the three techniques suggested by Neustadt and May. What is important, for this study, is did the policy-makers take the time to ask "what's the story?" to examine the policy on languages of instruction and how and why the policy changed over time. This will be determined by examining government documents, such as Department of Education memoranda and cabinet documents, as well as conducting personal interviews with key departmental officials to see what evidence exists of issue history being used in the development of this policy.

The final "mini-method" that was adapted was the "placement" method. Here again, it is not essential that the policy-makers involved in the Heritage Language Policy used all of Neustadt and May's techniques. What is important, for this study, is to determine whether the policy-makers attempted to gain a better understanding of the interests and possible reactions of the special interest groups (e.g. the Ukrainians) and the federal government. Once again, this will be done by examining government documents and conducting personal interviews with key departmental officials to see if there is any evidence of "placement" being used to help refine stereotypes which could help the policy-makers determine the most appropriate course of action.

SUMMARY

It has been argued in the second and third chapters that history is used by policy-makers involved in the public policy-making process and that most public policy-makers use history badly. The evidence given to support this assertion came from Neustadt and May and was based on case study evidence in American domestic and foreign policy as well as anecdotal evidence from their own experience and the experience of their students. There has been little or no work done in this field in connection to Canadian domestic or foreign policy. Thus, what the remainder of this study will attempt to do is to use some of the adapted techniques - the Modified Techniques - from Neustadt and May to determine whether the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta used history and whether that use was appropriate.

This will assist in determining whether the Heritage Language Policy was indeed an appropriate response to the change in the composition of Canadian society and the implementation of the federal government policy of multiculturalism in the early 1970s. As well, this study will demonstrate whether Neustadt and May's notions about the uses of history in the public policy-making process are only for the United States or whether they can be applied in other countries such as Canada.

CHAPTER 4

PLACING THE HERITAGE LANGUAGE POLICY IN A BROADER HISTORICAL CONTEXT

INTRODUCTION

The first three chapters have endeavoured to lay the groundwork for an analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta. It has been argued that most, if not all, public policy-makers use history in their decision-making; however, most do so badly. Thus, what is needed in policy analysis and research is a more discriminating use of history because, as has been demonstrated, history does have a role in the development of public policy. Yet it was also argued that history has a role in the analysis of public policy, and this being the case, the study will now turn to the analysis of the background and development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta.

There are two major aspects for this type of analysis: first, to determine whether this policy was an appropriate response to the changing make-up of Canadian and, subsequently, Albertan society; and second, to determine whether and how policy-makers used history in developing this policy. This chapter will focus on the former with the latter being examined in the next chapter. Thus, the first step towards determining whether the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta was an appropriate policy response is to place the policy in its broader historical context. To do this, it will be necessary to examine the nature of certain changes in the composition of Canadian society and how this led to the federal policy of multiculturalism. Out of this examination will come an understanding of how education was affected and finally how the Heritage Language Policy fitted into the broader Canadian experience. This will not be an exhaustive study because it is possible to write at length on immigration and multiculturalism. Instead it will be a selective overview that will place the Heritage Language Policy in a broader historical context.

Of course, in beginning this analysis, it is important to keep in mind the warning about subjectivity that was issued in previous chapters. It is also important to point out that both primary and secondary sources will be used, but that the secondary sources will provide much of the 'story'. This is due to the fact that what is crucial at this point is a general understanding of the broader historical context not exhaustive original research. This will come later when government documents and personal interviews are examined to determine whether and how history was used in the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta as well as the final outcome of determining the appropriateness of this policy given the historical context. It is important to mention that there are many other reasons for a policy being appropriate (e.g. political expediency); however, this chapter will not attempt to evaluate appropriateness based on those other grounds. Instead this chapter will evaluate appropriateness based on whether the policy fits the broader historical context of: a large portion Alberta's population being ethnic minorities (neither of British or French origin), increased tolerance and allowance for ethnic diversity in Alberta, and the increase in the influence and voice of the ethnic minorities resulting in them demanding a change in policy.

THE CHANGING COMPOSITION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY

> The Government of Canada recognizes the diversity of Canadians as regards race, national or ethnic origin, colour and religion as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society and is committed to a policy of multiculturalism designed to preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of Canadians while working to achieve the equality of all Canadians in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada.[1]

The above excerpt from the Canadian Multiculturalism Act (1988) is the most recent expression of a dramatic policy shift by the federal government[2] concerning Canadians who are neither of British nor French ethnic origin. It is an attempt to recognize the change in the ethnic and linguistic composition of Canadian society which remained rather consistent in the first hundred years after Confederation, but has undergone more rapid change in the last thirty years. It should be pointed out that "with the exception of Native people, today's entire Canadian population consists of immigrants and their direct descendents."[3] However, it was not until the 1960s that the federal government began to reconsider previous immigration policies. It was the federal government's immigration policy which influenced the introduction of the policy of multiculturalism. Of course, there are many reasons for the development of a policy on multiculturalism; however, the shift in immigration policy will now be examined with some of other reasons being explored later.

---

[1] Canadian Multiculturalism Act (Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, 1988).

[2] The term 'federal government' will be used to refer to the entity that governs Canada regardless of its attachment to specific political parties at any specific time. This does not mean that different federal governments did not take somewhat different positions on the issues of immigration and multiculturalism.

[3] Alan B. Anderson and James S. Frideres, Ethnicity in Canada: Theoretical Perspectives (Toronto: Butterworths & Co. Ltd., 1981), p. 130.

At first, it would be easy to simply label the federal governments of 1867 to the early 1960s as supremacist - as being obsessed with Anglo-conformity.[4] Although there is some truth to this, a closer examination of the history of immigration to Canada will reveal that the shift in policy occurred at the appropriate time. Yet, even if the timing of the policy can be deemed appropriate, there is still the question of whether the policy shift was necessary and whether the form it took was appropriate. If one were to step inside an average Canadian classroom or to walk around a shopping mall of any major Canadian city, the evidence of Canada's cultural and ethnic diversity would be self-evident. For many, if not most, this would be all the evidence needed to decide on the necessity and appropriateness of the federal government's policy on multiculturalism. Yet these observations do not fully explain why there was a shift in policy. In order to understand this shift, it is necessary to examine the history of immigration and immigration policy in order to determine whether the Canadian Multiculturalism

---

[4] The concept of 'Anglo-conformity' describes the belief that things British were best and that it was in the best interests of not only the British Empire, but also the non-British subjects, that everyone should attempt to put on the characteristics of the proper nineteenth century Englishman.

Act has its roots in history. Once the timing of the policy has been discussed, then attention can be turned to appropriateness of the policy. Thus, what follows is an overview of the change in the ethnic and linguistic composition of Canada beginning in seventeenth century New France.

When the French landed in the new world and claimed it for the King of France in the seventeenth century, they came with a colonial mentality and a mercantilistic economic system.[5] Their goals were to establish and maintain political and economic control over New France in order to capitalize on the valuable primary resources, such as furs, which could be sent back to France.[6] Thus, in the beginning, the French (and later the British) were principally concerned with maintaining commercial and military relations with the Indians.[7] In order to achieve these goals, the French needed large numbers of French nationals to migrate; however, migration to the 'new world' was not popular in France.[8] This colonial immigration policy combined with a high birth rate to help the French maintain control of their newly acquired territory.[9] Of course, the victory of General Wolfe at the Plains of Abraham in 1759 began the shift to British instead of French dominance.[10]

---

[5] R. Douglas Francis, Richard Jones and Donald B. Smith's Origins: Canadian History to Confederation (Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada Limited, 1988), pp. 41-57.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Although this altered the Indian lifestyle in many ways such as changing from a subsistence economy to a more mercantile style economy, this period could be characterized as one of interdependence. Unfortunately, it was only the beginning of the transition for Indians to become more dependent upon the Europeans and lose their independence and self-determination.

E. Palmer Patterson, The Canadian Indian: A History Since 1500 (Don Mills, Ontario: Collier MacMillan Canada Ltd., 1972), pp. 67ff.

[8] Harold Troper, "Immigration" in The Canadian Encyclopedia , volume 2 (Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers Ltd., 1988), p. 1045.

British dominance outside the province of Quebec (Lower Canada) was solidified by the Constitution Act of 1791 and fifty years later by the Act of Union (1841). These pieces of legislation largely sustained the linguistic and religious compromises of the Quebec Act of 1774.[11] The Governor of British North America recognized the problems that the Royal Proclamation of 1763 had caused by imposing English law upon the French as well as other restrictions based on religious grounds.[12] Governor Carleton negotiated the Quebec Act of 1774 to restore some of the lost rights. The two dominant founding peoples[13] came to a compromise which protected the position of the Roman Catholic Church and allowed the people of Quebec to continue to use the French language and French civil law.[14] These rights were enshrined in the Constitution Act of 1791 and the Act of Union in 1841.[15]

---

[9] Anderson and Frideres, op. cit., pp. 131-139.

[10] Detailed accounts on New France can be found in W.L. Morton's The Kingdom of Canada (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1969), pp. 19-142 and Francis, Jones and Smith, op. cit., pp 41-125.

[11] Francis, Jones and Smith, op. cit., pp. 173-174.

[12] The imposition of English law simply confused and angered the people of Quebec who still desired to follow French civil law. The combination of confusion and resistance affected the administration of justice in the province.
Ibid., pp. 165-168.

[13] It is important to point out that the British and the French never recognized the Indians as a founding people. Today, this view has begun to change, at least, within the federal and some provincial governments.

The British became the dominant force in the remainder of British North America aided, in large part, by the influx of United Empire Loyalists.[16] As the British took control a new political structure and a new economic system based on industrialization came to the fore.[17] In the remainder of British North America, and subsequently Canada, the use of the English language and the establishment of British institutions became the norm. For example, the first lieutenant-governor of Upper Canada (1791-1796), John Graves Simcoe, did everything possible "to make Upper Canada a home fit for Loyalist heroes and a centre of British power in North America."[18] In order for the British to consolidate their gains, the British colonial authorities and later the Government of Canada sought to build up the British population base because it was crucial that the immigrants would conform to British ideals and the British way of life.[19] Not only would this consolidate the British hold, but it seemed only natural because things British were seen as superior.

---

[14] Francis, Jones and Smith, op. cit., pp.173-175.

[15] Examples of more detailed accounts of this period can be found in Morton, op. cit., pp. 143-162 and Francis, Jones and Smith, op. cit., pp. 162-193.

[16] Don Dawson and Brian Titley, "The Origins of Schooling in Selected Regions of Canada: An Interpretation" in Education in Canada: An Interpretation edited by E. Brian Titley and Peter J. Miller (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1982), p. 14.

[17] Anderson and Frideres, op. cit., pp. 131-139.

[18] Francis, Jones and Smith, op. cit., p. 200.

[19] Anderson and Frideres, op. cit., pp. 131-139.

With the French contained mostly within Quebec (although there were small pockets of francophones elsewhere), it was now possible to promote British institutions and values in the rest of British North America. It was believed that the easiest way for this Anglo-conformity to come about was through careful immigration. At the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries the vast majority of newcomers were from the British Isles and the United States.[20] The majority of Americans, in the late eighteenth century, were refugees from the American Revolution; however, after the War of 1812, the colonial government looked almost exclusively to Britain as a source of immigrants.[21] This preference for English, Irish, Scottish and Welsh immigrants continued well into the late 1880s.[22] It can even be argued that it was this notion of Anglo-superiority and the need for Anglo-conformity which fueled the moves to stop bilingualism in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories in the late nineteenth century.[23]

---

[20] Robert J. Carney, "Going to School in Upper Canada" in Canadian Education: Historical Themes and Contemporary Issues edited by E. Brian Titley (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1990), pp. 12-15.

[21] The obvious reason for this shift was the fear of the United States and republicanism. The Rebellions of 1837 provided further evidence, at least in the eyes of the government, that Americans could not be trusted and should not be encouraged to come to Canada.
Francis, Jones and Smith, op. cit., pp. 214-215.

[22] Warren E. Kalbach, "Growth and Distribution of Canada's Ethnic Populations, 1871-1971" in Ethnic Canada: Identities and Inequalities edited by Leo Driedger (Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd., 1987), pp. 82-89.

[23] In the late nineteenth century there was a shift in the composition of the province of Manitoba. In the beginning the province was made up of mostly francophones then the proportions were more or less even between francophones and anglophones; however, by the 1880s, there was a majority of anglophones. This shift caused some changes in government policy including the elimination of bilingualism and bilingual schooling in

Until the 1880s, the make-up of the immigrants allowed into Canada took care of the need for Anglo-conformity.[24] However, this policy of preferred immigration changed in the 1880s when the federal government saw the need to establish sovereignty over the West due to a perceived threat from the United States. At first, the government continued to encourage Ontarians of British origin and new British immigrants to move West; however, the influx of these immigrants did not meet the demand for farmers/settlers. This meant that the government needed to look elsewhere. First, the government turned to northern Europe because these people most resembled the British, so the government encouraged the immigration of German-speaking people and Scandinavians.[25] However, near the end of the nineteenth century there was still a need for more farmers and workers which meant that the Minister of the Interior, who was responsible for immigration, Clifford Sifton, was forced to look elsewhere.[26] The "Canadian government's aggressive policy to develop the agricultural potential of the West"[27] meant that the next alternative was to encourage the people

---

1890. There was a compromised reached in 1896/97 which lasted until 1916 when bilingualism was eliminated once again.

[24] Troper, op. cit., p. 1046.

[25] Information based on Census of Canada, 1871-1971 as complied by Anderson and Frideres, op. cit., pp. 136-137.

[26] Nick Kach, "Education and Ethnic Acculturation: A Case Study" in Essays on Canadian Education edited by Nick Kach, Kas Mazurek, Robert S. Patterson and Ivan DeFaveri (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1986), pp. 43-44.

[27] Anderson and Frideres, op. cit., p. 134.

from central and eastern Europe to immigrate to Canada. Of course, there were still French, Italians and Spaniards who could have been recruited; however, the government believed that the West required 'hearty' people suited for the harsh life on the prairies. The government believed that the peasants from central and eastern Europe would be better suited and opened the doors to these new immigrants even though many citizens saw them as undesirable because they were seen as inferior due to their education, ideas, moral standards and way of life.[28] In fact, there were politicians who felt that these new immigrants were nothing but a handicap to the more civilized and progressive settlers.[29] It seems that if the government had had other options, it would not have allowed Slavic people (of which, according to Department of Immigration statistics, one hundred and seventy thousand arrived between 1896 and 1914) into Canada; however, the government grudgingly allowed their admission in order to open and develop the West.[30]

With this influx of non-British immigrants, the idea of Anglo-conformity became more crucial because the assumption of the dominant British group in Canada was "that immigrants admitted to the country or their descendents would [need to] assimilate to the

---

[28] Vegreville Observer (Vegreville, Alberta, July 29, 1908)take from Kach, op. cit., p. 45.

[29] Frank Oliver, Member of Parliament for Strathcona, Debates in the House of Commons, July 26, 1899 taken from Kach, op. cit., p. 46.

[30] Kach, op. cit., p. 44.

British group."[31] Canadians of British descent worried that the illiteracy and poverty of such groups as the Slavs would drag down the cultural level of the whole area and undermine "Anglo-Saxon" institutions.[32] Essentially, the dominant British group believed that their language and institutions were superior to any other. Thus, assimilation was seen as necessary because the language of commerce, law and schooling was English; and the new immigrants, in order to help improve Canada, needed to know and use English as well as become loyal to Canada and its 'British' institutions.[33] This meant that both the federal and provincial governments desired the new immigrants to be assimilated into the British way of life. One of the main instruments of assimilation was the public school system. Although formal education in each province had its own characteristics, there were some basic similarities which allow for some generalizations to be made. The basic language of instruction was English and teaching centered around Britain and its Empire in such subjects as history which focused on the greatness of the Empire.[34] During this time, 1896 to 1914, bilingual education was allowed in some provinces such as Manitoba; however, the First

---

[31] Jean R. Burnet and Howard Palmer, Coming Canadians: An Introduction to a History of Canada's People (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Inc., 1988), p. 223.

[32] H. Palmer, Land of the Second Chance (Lethbridge, Alberta: The Lethbridge Herald, 1972), p. 73.

[33] Carney, "Going to School in Upper Canada", pp. 32-37.

[34] There were allowances for instruction in other languages (e.g. French); however, by the late 1880s, English was compulsory in Upper Canada. Ibid.

World War brought an end to this practice and resulted in more prejudice against the 'enemies' of the Empire including German-speaking and Slavic peoples as well as francophones, whose support for the war was less than enthusiastic.

The first ten year period after the First World War saw a series of immigration laws which limited the influx of specific groups such as German-speaking and Slavic peoples. These discriminatory laws restricted immigration into Canada until after the Second World War.[35] It should be noted that there were other factors which helped slow immigration, for example, the world-wide economic crisis known as the Great Depression. After the Second World War, immigration increased with greater numbers and greater diversity, yet there were still some restrictions.[36] This last major wave of immigration largely involved individuals who were educated and/or had some useful skills to offer their new country. At first the government still looked to Europe, the United States and Australia for immigrants; "however, with some liberalization of immigration policies (in 1962 and 1967), during the sixties and particularly the seventies, European countries have been progressively and rapidly de-emphasized as sources for emigrants to Canada."[37] In 1962 the government introduced new immigration legislation which would make Canada's immigration policy more universal and nondiscriminatory.[38] It was this shift which resulted in more immigrants from Africa, Asia, Latin and South America.

---

[35] Troper, op. cit., p. 1047.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Anderson and Frideres, op. cit., p. 158.

Thus, the ethnic and cultural make-up of Canada began to change dramatically in the 1960s. Up to this point, although there were many ethnic groups, most were of European origin. This new influx of non-Europeans meant that the ethnic and cultural diversity of Canada greatly increased. This change in Canadian society helped to bring other changes in the 1960s. "Until the 1960s government policy concerning immigration was based upon the principle that those who were admitted into Canadian society should be assimilated into the dominant British and French ethnic groups."[39] The focus, thus far, has been on the dominant British group because that was the group which was dominant in the West, especially in Alberta. However, it is important to note that the immigrants who settled in Quebec underwent a similar experience to the immigrants who settled in the rest of Canada. Just as the immigrants to other parts of Canada experienced the pressures of Anglo-conformity, so those who went to Quebec experienced the pressures of Franco-conformity. The government of Quebec has been especially concerned with immigration for the last three decades. The concern is centered around the fear of Quebec losing its Frenchness; thus, Quebec has tried to recruit French-speaking immigrants and has passed legislation to ensure that immigrants who settle in Quebec form part of the francophone community.[40] Quebec's ability to 'select' immigrants is part of a special immigration agreement with the federal government (there are now agreements with several other provinces).

---

[38] Gerald E. Dirks, "Immigration Policy" in The Canadian Encyclopedia , volume 2 (Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, Ltd., 1988), p. 1047.

[39] Jean R. Burnet, "Multiculturalism in Canada" in Ethnic Canada: Identities and Inequalities edited by Leo Driedger (Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, Ltd., 1987), p. 65.

During the 1970s, federal immigration and population policies were officially reviewed, a Green Paper on Immigration Policy[41] and a report to Parliament by a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons(1975) were prepared.[42] Almost all the Committee's recommendations were accepted by the Liberal government and absorbed into a new Immigration Act which was proclaimed in 1978 and which established for the first time the fundamental objectives of Canada's immigration policy. They include the promotion of Canada's demographic, economic, social and cultural goals; family reunion; nondiscrimination; fulfillment of Canada's international obligations in relation to refugees; and co-operation between all levels of government as well as the voluntary sector, in promoting the adaptation of newcomers to Canadian society.[43]

---

[40] The most important piece of legislation in this regard is the Charter of the French Language which was lasted amended in 1988. Of special interest is chapter VIII, which deals with the Language of Instruction, because it restricts the use of English as the language of instruction and in effect forces all immigrant children to learn in French.

[41] The term 'Green Paper' refers to a discussion paper on a specific policy that has been prepared by the federal government in order to have consultation before a formal policy is adopted.

[42] Dirks, op. cit., 1047.

[43] Ibid.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, many would argue that Canadian immigration policy is not as egalitarian as generally believed. The government still admits immigrants based on three broad classes: family reunion, demand - the ability to meet the needs of Canada either through their skills (labour market) or their ability to provide capital for investment - and refugees; however, in recent years the government has focused on encouraging professionals and entrepreneurs to migrant to Canada.[44] Thus, Canada's immigration policy is nondiscriminatory regarding race or ethnic origin, yet there are 'preferred' immigrants.

Thus, the changing immigration policies have greatly influenced the change in the composition of Canadian society and have led to other changes such as the concept of Anglo-conformity being replaced by the notion of the Canadian mosaic which is "a theory that ethnic groups contributed and should contribute to Canadian society and culture by keeping their ancestral cultures and traditions."[45] To have this shift before the Second World War was not possible because the the make-up of Canadian society was still 80% British and French with 18.9% being other ethnic groups - mostly Europeans (1.1% were determined to be Natives).[46] Although there were many different ethnic and cultural groups, the differences were not immediately apparent. This was especially true after the first generation because the second and third generation descendents had to some degree assimilated into the Anglo society.[47] However, with the increase of immigrants from Africa, Asia, Latin and South America, the differences became more apparent. Not only did they look different, but some had very different forms of religion and culture; thus, assimilation appeared less likely. By 1971 the British and French ethnic groups made up only 73.3% of the population with other ethnic groups making up 25.3% (1.4% were determined to be Natives).[48] This trend continues with approximately 33% of the Canadian population being neither of British nor French origin in 1981 and there are estimates that the figure could be as high as 40% today.[49] It was not simply the numerical increase, but the degree of greater diversity which helped pave the way for change. This shift away from Anglo-conformity towards an "official recognition of the diversity of the population as continuing and desirable"[50] could only have occurred in the 1960s and the following decades.

---

[44] Ibid., p. 1048.

[45] Burnet and Palmer, op. cit., p. 223.

[46] Information based on Census of Canada, 1941 as complied by Anderson and Frideres, op. cit., p. 104.

---

[47] Burnet and Palmer, op. cit., p. 220.

[48] Information based on Census of Canada, 1941 as complied by Anderson and Frideres, op. cit., p. 104.

[49] Information based on Focus on Canada: Ethnic Diversity in Canada (Ministry of Supply and Services, 1990).

[50] Burnet, "Multiculturalism in Canada", p. 65.

THE POLICY OF MULTICULTURALISM

In addition to the change in the composition of Canadian society brought on by federal immigration policy, there are two other significant factors which influenced this shift in policy away from Anglo-conformity towards multiculturalism. The first was the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism and the second was the reaction to the Commission in the 1960s. The Commission was established by the federal government in 1963 and focused primarily upon the two founding peoples (leaving out the Natives). This upset many within the non-British, non-French population which demanded greater equality and recognition. What fuelled this protest was the resurgence in interest in ethnic identity by upwardly mobile second and third generation descendents of central and eastern European immigrants, especially the Ukrainians.[51] These people's parents had sacrificed much to come to Canada and to some degree submitted to Anglo-conformity in order to provide their children with a better future. Many of these children had become professionals and were now looking to regain their ethnic identities and to gain recognition for their ethnic groups' contributions to Canada.[52]

One of the results of these ethnic demands was the fourth book of the Commission's Report entitled The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups (1969) which proposed sixteen recommendations concerning education, media and ethnic rights. In general, the recommendations encouraged the promotion of the languages and cultures of citizens who were neither of British nor French ethnic origin. The combination of a visible change in the make-up of Canadian society along with the demands of other ethnic groups for equality and recognition and the Commission's fourth book resulted in the Trudeau government's policy on multiculturalism. "On October 8, 1971, the Prime Minister announced the federal government's response [to the Commission's fourth book], which was to accept all those recommendations directed to federal departments and agencies and to proclaim a policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework."[53] This new policy was announced in the House of Commons the federal government pledged to support such a policy in four ways:

---

[51] Kach, op. cit., p. 57f.

[52] Burnet and Palmer, op. cit., p. 226.

> First, resources permitting, the government will seek to assist all Canadian cultural groups that have demonstrated a desire and effort to continue to develop a capacity to grow and contribute to Canada, and a clear need for assistance, the small and weak groups no less than the strong and highly organized.
>
> Second, the government will assist members of all cultural groups to overcome cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society.
>
> Third, the government will promote creative encounters and interchange among all Canadian cultural groups in the interests of national unity.
>
> Fourth, the government will continue to assist immigrants to acquire at least one of Canada's official languages in order to become full participants in Canadian society.[54]

---

[53] Burnet, "Multiculturalism in Canada", p. 68.

[54] House of Commons Debates 1971a (Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, 1971).

With this speech in the House of Commons, Trudeau introduced the policy of multiculturalism with its goals directed towards recognizing and enhancing the cultural diversity of Canada while, at the same time, maintaining national unity. Since 1971 the federal government has funded special programs to promote ethnic cultures and languages because the goal of the policy "was and still remains to encourage the maintenance of ethnic groups through financial assistance, public recognition of these groups and the establishment of national agencies."[55] Some ethnic groups are disappointed with the government's commitment to multiculturalism saying that not enough monies go into programs and that this demonstrates that the government is not committed to this policy.[56] Although the Trudeau government's policy was the basis for the Mulroney government's Multiculturalism Act (1988), which is the most recent expression of the federal government's policy shift away from Anglo or Franco-conformity towards greater appreciation of the ethnic diversity of Canada, there continues to be much debate concerning the present government's commitment, especially since the recent federal budget ended support for Heritage Languages.

The policy of multiculturalism has deep historical roots which reflect the changing nature of Canadian society. The policy evolved as a result of changes to Canadian society and exists today because it still reflects the present nature of Canadian society. However, it is important to note that this shift in federal policy was also a result of vocal minority ethnic groups who, due to the change in the composition of Canadian society were now an important political force, were listened to by the politicians.

---

[55] Anderson and Frideres, op. cit., p. 297.

[56] Jean R. Burnet, "Multiculturalism" in The Canadian Encyclopedia, volume 3 (Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers Ltd., 1988), p. 1401.

Nevertheless, there is much debate and criticism about the appropriateness of the policy and how it has been implemented. Here it will only be possible to discuss three of these criticisms. Rene Levesque (former Premier of Quebec) and other French Canadians have regarded the policy as simply another attempt to weaken the French position as one of the two founding peoples and make the French another minority. Once this happens the fear is that French Canadians will lose their cultural identity as they are assimilated into the Anglo majority.[57] Although these fears are understandable, once again, it is important to point out that there are special provisions in Canadian and Quebec law for immigration and language protection. A second criticism is that of some of the ethnic minorities regard the policy as long on rhetoric but short on action. That is, a government is not judged by what it says but what it does and the policy is an unacceptable substitute for substantial aid;[58] however, given the current economic climate it is doubtful the federal government can be more generous. In fact, as mentioned previously, it has ended Heritage Language grants. And finally, the policy has been viewed as simply an attempt to 'buy' ethnic votes;[59]

---

[57] Burnet and Palmer, op. cit., p. 226.

[58] Burnet, "Multiculturalism", p. 1401.

[59] Burnet and Palmer, op. cit., p. 226.

however, the present policy is not simply a product of political convenience, although this may have been a factor, the Trudeau government believed in the equality of all Canadians and was committed to equality; thus, it acted to help bring about greater equality for ethnic groups or perhaps more accurately greater equality for individuals from minority ethnic groups. After Trudeau brought the British North America Act (1867) back to Canada and passed the Constitution Act (1982), the diverse make-up of Canadian society was enshrined in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in Section 27 which recognizes the importance of preserving and enhancing the multicultural heritage of Canada.[60] In addition, the Charter guarantees equality and protection against discrimination based on ethnic or national origin.[61] While it is true that these changes did require some of the minority ethnic groups to put political pressure on the government, the rationale behind the policy shift was not simply an attempt to gain 'ethnic votes'. But the policy was based on some of the notions of Trudeau liberalism which held that every individual is equal before and under the law[62] regardless of the ethnic or national origin.

It seems clear that the policy of multiculturalism developed when the necessary conditions were present. It could not have developed before the 1960s because of the composition of Canadian society and the lack of a strong minority voice in Ottawa. The rise of a strong minority voice resulted from certain minority groups reaching levels of economic influence and power which meant it as difficult to ignore their demands. As discussed earlier, it was the shift in immigration policy which caused the shift in the make-up of Canadian society which ultimately resulted in the policy of multiculturalism. The full implications of this policy on education are still unclear. "However, since the schools are seen as having a key role to play in many of the programs of multiculturalism, and education is under provincial jurisdiction, provincial initiatives are an essential part"[63] of any multicultural education programs. As of 1987, only four provinces - Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario and Saskatchewan - had official policies on multiculturalism. Yet schools can play a part by expanding the use of non-official languages of instruction, the teaching of non-official languages as subjects, the teaching of various cultures and the introduction of multiculturalism as a topic in the curriculum.[64] Some provinces have taken steps to include some or all of the above in their schools. In fact, the province of Alberta has taken steps to expand the use of non-official languages of instruction in their schools. This expansion occurred, for the most part, because of the Heritage Language Policy and it is to the development of this policy that this study now turns.

---

[60] Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Section 27 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, 1982).

[61] Ibid., Section 15.

[62] Ibid.

---

[63] Burnet, "Multiculturalism in Canada", p. 70.

[64] Ibid.

THE EFFECTS ON SCHOOLING

The tracing of Canadian immigration policy offers, at least, partial explanation for the development of the policy of multiculturalism. What is evident from this is that the policy of multiculturalism did not simply appear during the 1960s, rather it was a result of shifts in government policy and other factors over a lengthy period of time. However, the question that still remains is: What effect did the development of the policy of multiculturalism have on schooling in Canada? Of course, this is a large question and it is necessary, for the purposes of this study, to discuss it in specific terms. Thus, the question will be restricted to educational policy in Alberta and, more specifically, to the Heritage Language Policy that was announced in 1971. However, it is not enough simply to examine the educational policy of Alberta in the 1960s as background for the development of the Heritage Language Policy. It is necessary to start with the arrival of the first permanent European settlers in order to determine the trends in policies regarding languages of instruction.

The education which occurred in New France had three distinct target groups: the Indians, the poor settlers and the elite settlers. Before the arrival of the first permanent European settlers, the Indians had "well-established education practices designed to ensure cultural continuity, and through which the youth were provided with the life skills necessary for their future roles in their societies."[65] Although this was not formal education in the

---

[65] Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, Indian Education Paper - Phase 1 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, 1982), annex C, p. 2.

European sense, it was Indian-controlled education which prepared Indian children for the environment in which they were to live.[66] The Indian schooling experience closely parallels their broader experience in a Euro-Canadian context in that slowly over time, the Indians lost control over the education of their children. This loss of control resulted in the loss of skills in certain traditional areas such as hunting and trapping which had some negative psychological and social outcomes for the children and their parents.

As mentioned earlier, contact with Europeans brought about changes in the traditional Indian way of life and education was one of the areas affected. With the arrival of French settlers came Roman Catholic missionaries who, supported by the church and other charitable societies, established schools for Indian children. This was the beginning of a policy of assimilation which had as a goal the elimination of Indian culture, traditions and values. Although there was some instruction in Indian languages, the primary language of instruction was French and the program of study centered around religion with the hope of 'Christianizing' Indian children. As for the education of the poor French settlers, it was believed that they lived lives of crime and immorality and that basic Christian instruction could save them from this type of life.[67] However, nothing elaborate was considered. "In the petites ecoles of the parishes little was attempted beyond catechism and the rudiments of literacy and numeracy."[68] Even with these limited educational goals there seemed to be a great disparity between literacy rates in urban and rural settings.[69] Nevertheless, it would appear that the school and literacy rates in New France were comparable to those in France at the same time.[70] In contrast to both the education given to the Indians and the poor settlers, the elite received quality education from the Jesuits and the Ursulines in a variety of institutions established for this purpose.[71] Although there were many differences in the education of these three groups, there were important common components such as its religious nature and the use of French as the language of instruction.

---

[66] Cornelius Jaenen, "Amerindian Views of French Culture in the Seventeenth Century" in the Canadian Historical Review, vol LV, no. 3, Sept. 1974.

[67] Cornelius Jaenen, The Role of the Church in New France (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, Ryerson, 1976), pp. 96-97.

When Britain expanded its control in North America after the conquest in 1759, changes in education followed. However, the education system in Quebec was left relatively untouched. In fact, the system which "was designed to inculcate loyalty to the church and her teachings among all sections of society . . . survived almost intact in French Canada for two hundred years after the conquest."[72]

---

[68] E. Brian Titley, "Tradition, Change and Education in French Canada" in Education in Canada: An Interpretation edited by E. Brian Titley and Peter J. Miller (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1982), p. 49.

[69] According to Roger Magnuson, the difference was in the order of five times greater literacy in the cities than rural areas (50% to 10%). This information can be found in his work, A Brief History of Quebec Education (Montreal: Harvest House, 1980), p. 8.

[70] Louis-Philippe Audet, Historie de l'enseignment au Quebec, Tome I 1608-1840 (Montreal/Toronto: Holt, Rinehart et Winston Ltee, 1971), pp. 152-153.

[71] Titley, "Tradition, Change and Education in French Canada", p. 49.

[72] Ibid., p. 51.

This was, in part, due to the legislative compromises worked out between the English and the French beginning with the Quebec Act (1774) and continuing with the Constitution Act (1791), the Act of Union (1841) and the British North America Act (1867). However, within the remainder of British North America, schooling underwent major changes. The first eighty years after the conquest of New France saw major missionary activity from the Church of England and subsequently, other Protestant denominations such as the Methodists. This activity followed much the same pattern as Roman Catholic missionary activity in that education was a primary concern and was directed towards three distinct groups - the Indians, the poor and the elite - with much the same effect.

The vast majority of schools for Indian children were church-run and were part of their evangelistic outreach to the Indian population.[73] The primary concern was the souls of both adults and children which meant that, in order to effectively communicate their evangelistic messages, many of these schools used Indian languages, but only for catechectical purposes. Most instruction was in English because, as has been previously stated, English was the language of the British Empire and the majority of the population in its colonies in North America. Indian schooling was primarily done in day schools until 1870 and then residential schools became an important means of native education. There was a common fear that the Indians would become a pauper class so, in order to prevent this, both academic and trade skills were taught.[74] It was not until after the Second World War that this notion of 'work and study' in Indian schooling underwent some important changes.

---

[73] E. Brian Titley, "Indian Industrial Schools in Western Canada" in Schools in the West edited by Nancy M. Sheehan, J. Donald Wilson and David C. Jones (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1986), p. 133.

Prior to the 1840s, the education of the elite European settlers in British North America was very similar in form (although not content) with what was provided in French Canada; however, the education, if one can to use this term, of the poor was handled mainly at home by the parents. Although there were some church-run schools and some private tutors/teachers who offered their services, few of the children of the poor attended because of the family's need for them on the farm and the fact that most schools required payment of fees. There was no organized system of educating the children of the poor.[75] On the other hand, the children of the more well-to-do received their education either through the services of private tutors/teachers or institutions run by the Church of England. Both of these options involved the paying of fees which, in essence, restricted access to formal education to the children of the more well-to-do.

The above describes the educational circumstances in British North America, especially Upper Canada, prior to the Act of Union (1841);[76] however, major changes began to occur once the two

---

[74] Ibid., pp. 133-134.

[75] Dawson and Titley, op. cit., p. 15.

[76] Except for the fur traders there were very few settlers west of Upper Canada prior to the nineteenth century; thus, it is possible to make the above generalizations. This is, especially true, because the few settlers that were present in the West would have had to take care of their children's own education as there was no other option.

Canadas joined. Of course, there were other factors involved in the changes to education in Upper Canada including industrialization and urbanization which brought on changes in the family structure.[77] The advent of industrialization brought on the urbanization of Upper Canada which led to the creation of a middle class. It also led to a shift away from the extended family to more of a nuclear family unit which resulted in more parental responsibility in some areas.[78] For example, these changes led to the assigning of certain educational tasks to the parents such as protecting their children from the larger society and, at the same time, preparing them to function in it.[79] Often, because of the need to work long hours, certain educational needs could not be met in the family context which meant that other agencies needed to take over some responsibilities such as education.[80]

This is the context from which Egerton Ryerson emerged to design and implement the first public school system in Canada. Although Ryerson's system did not eliminate Roman Catholic schooling in Upper Canada, it did restrict government funding to the public system.[81] Of greater importance is the fact that Ryerson's system influenced the school systems that would follow in the West. Ryerson's system had five major components which would provide the foundations for the school systems in the West. These components were: free - there were no fees because the system was supported by property tax, compulsory attendance - for all school aged children, standardized curricula and textbooks, elected trustees - oversaw the operation of the schools and centralized control was placed in the Department of Education.[82] The essence of Ryerson's curricula was to instill certain middle class values in children, especially the lower class children. These values included a sense of Christian morality, loyalty to the British Crown, and values, such as diligence, punctuality and regularity, that would prepare them to become part of an industrialized work force.[83] These values fit into the notion of Anglo-superiority and help explain why the schools were used to assimilate the non-English speaking immigrants and why the language of instruction in Ontario public schools was English only (with the notable exception of French which was used until 1912).

---

[77] Alison Prentice, "Education and the Metaphor of the Family: the Upper Canadian Example" in History of Education Quarterly, 12, no. 3 (1972), p. 282.

[78] Ibid., p. 286.

[79] Carney, "Going to School in Upper Canada", p. 16.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Ibid., p. 31.

Thus, schooling in Quebec and Ontario occurred in the language of the majority, that is, in French and English respectively. But what about schooling in the rest of Canada? The western prairies were Canada's great frontier during the nineteenth century. In fact, the annexation and settlement of the prairies had been one of the chief objectives of the fathers of Confederation. Title to the vast region known as Rupert's Land and the North-West Territories was held by the Hudson's Bay Company through its charter from Charles II in 1670.

---

[82] Ibid., pp. 28-42.

[83] Ibid.

When the Hudson's Bay Company established its trading posts in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, it did not intend for these posts to become permanent settlements for their employees. In fact, the Company disapproved of any social contact between its employees and Indian women;[84] thus, prior to the emergence of a distinct country-born population, the Company did not issue any directives to its employees about formal education. Once the Indians had been brought into the fur trade, there was no further need to change their lives, their religion or their language. In essence, the educational and 'Christianization' efforts of the Company were virtually non-existent. However, by the end of the eighteenth century, there was a growing number of children at the posts as a result of the 'illicit' relationships between Company employees and Indian women and the Company was forced to address the question of education in Rupert's Land.[85]

One of the major reasons why the Company was forced to devise a policy on the education of country-born children was that some of its employees felt obliged to educate their children which meant, in some cases, sending the children to England.[86] The

---

[84] E.E. Rich, Hudson's Bay Company Letters Outwards, 1679 - 1694 (London: Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1948), pp. 40-41.

[85] Issac K. Mabindisa, The Praying Man: The Life and Times of Henry Bird Steinhauer (Ph.D. dissertation) (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1984), p. 128.

[86] Ibid., p. 130.

Company had to expend time and money to provide passage for these children and other benefits; thus, it decided it would be easier and cheaper to educate them in Rupert's Land.[87] This situation, as Jennifer Brown points out, presented the Company with problems and possibilities.[88] The Company hoped that the children who received training in basic literacy and numeracy skills along with apprenticeship programs would become Company employees;[89] thus, the 1790s saw the first steps taken towards the education of country-born children.[90] The instruction of the children in the posts was done in an ad hoc manner until 1807 when surgeons were asked to teach and later in 1808 when the first schoolmasters arrived.[91] Unfortunately, these efforts met with little success because the schoolmasters soon turned to the more lucrative and prestigious occupations in the fur trade. However, the Company was more concerned with its bloody rivalry with the North-West Company than with its limited success in education.

In 1821 the Hudson's Bay Company merged with its rival the North-West Company. This coincided with the arrival of new missionaries, such as John West, who saw education as a primary concern due to its importance in converting the Indians.[92] The missionaries desired the Indians to settle in agricultural communities in order to be 'civilized' and 'Christianized' and this caused the missionaries, especially John West, to be faced with opposition and indifference from Company officials because they saw education as harming the fur trade.[93] Nevertheless, the Company did permit day and residential schools to open in the Red River Settlement because this allowed the Company to end its active involvement in the education of country-born children. If Company employees wanted their children educated then they would have to send them to Red River or to institutions in eastern Canada or Britain. This new educational policy of the Company had two key principles: "first that the Company was not obliged to pay any of the costs of elementary schooling provided by the missions or to hire any mission school graduates; and second, that such schooling would . . . not interfere with the activities of trappers and others engaged in the fur trade."[94] These schools were only for country-born and Metis children. There was no attempt to educate the Indian population until the missionaries moved further West in the 1840s. Once the missionaries moved out of Red River, church-run residential schools were established throughout the prairies. The language of instruction depended on the denomination (e.g. French for Roman Catholic and English for Protestant), but as in Ontario and Quebec, Indian languages were sometimes used in cathetical instruction.

---

[87] Ibid.

[88] Jennifer Brown, "A Colony of Very Useful Hands" in The Beaver (Spring 1977), p. 39.

[89] Ibid.

[90] Mabindisa, op. cit., pp. 130-131.

[91] Ibid., p. 131.

---

[92] Ibid., p. 134.

[93] Ibid., p. 137.

[94] Robert J. Carney, "The Grey Nuns and the Children of Holy Angels" in Proceedings of the Fort Chipewyan and Fort Vermilion Bicentennial Conference edited by Patricia A. McCormack and R. Geoffrey Ironside (Edmonton: Boreal Institute, University of Alberta, 1990), p. 295.

Thus, in the prairies, the chief educational concern was with the country-born and Metis children of Company employees until the federal government purchased Rupert's Land and the North-West Territories from the Hudson's Bay Company in 1869. Out of the land that was purchased came the tiny province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories and with the purchase came a wave of immigration from Ontario and the British Isles and later from other parts of Europe. With the influx of English Protestants the composition of Manitoba and, eventually, the entire West changed. This change in composition also brought with it changes in education.

In Manitoba the change in the ethnic and linguistic composition brought dramatic changes in education. In 1870 there was a dual system of education in Manitoba which served the Roman Catholic and Protestant portion of the population. In fact, the Board of Education was split into two sections - Catholic and Protestant - with each section controlling its own schools; however, the change in demographics brought changes to this system. In 1875 the provincial school grants were no longer divided equally, but on a per student basis which meant that the Protestant schools received more government money. This was just a taste of what was to come. In 1890 the Liberal government of Thomas Greenway passed a new School Act which eliminated government grants to separate schools which were largely French and Catholic, and made English the only language of instruction in public schools. Eventually a compromise was reached (the Laurier-Greenway Compromise) in which, if numbers warranted, bilingual instruction during the school day was permitted. This compromise did not please everyone; however, it did allow for bilingual schooling until 1916 when it was eliminated altogether because of fears associated with the First World War.[95]

For a short period of time bilingual schooling existed in Manitoba, but what did this mean for the rest of the North-West Territories? Even though the North-West Territories became part of the dominion of Canada in 1870, the missionaries continued to be solely responsible for providing educational services until 1875. In that year an Ordinance was passed by the territorial government which provided enabling legislation for the provision of education by setting the size of a school district (1000 inhabitants residing in 1000 square mile area), allowing for the election of three trustees for each district and permitting the trustees to levy taxes to support schools.[96] However, the criteria for establishing a school district could not be met anywhere in the Territories, which resulted in no school districts being established. This meant that missionaries continued to provide educational services. One reason for the lack of inhabitants is that the settlement of Saskatchewan and Alberta did not really begin until the late 1870s and the educational work of the missionaries was largely to provide mission schools and orphanages for Indian and Metis children.[97]

---

[95] The general information regarding the Manitoba School Question was taken from:

E. Brian Titley, "Religion, Culture and Power: The School Question in Manitoba" in Canadian Education: Historical Themes and Contemporary Issues edited by E. Brian Titley (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1990), pp. 45-77.

Lovell Clark, "Plain English: Manitoba 1890" in Horizon Canada edited by Benoit Robert, Michael MacDonald and Raynald Nadeau (Quebec: Universite Laval, 1987), vol. 6, pp. 1681-1687.

[96] The North-West Territories Ordinance, 1875 in Statutes of Alberta (Edmonton).

What is significant about the work of the missionaries, especially the Roman Catholic missionaries, was that the schooling was done either in English or French or both. For example, "in 1875 [Bishop] Grandin reported that seventy to eighty pupils of both sexes were being taught by two sisters [Grey Nuns], in both French and English, at the mission in St. Albert [Alberta]."[98] In the beginning the racial, religious and linguistic conflict/tensions were few because "the population was small and the vast and mighty wilderness made the differences between French-speaking Catholics and English-speaking Protestants of little consequence."[99] This is evident in the territorial School Ordinance of 1884 where a Board of Education was established with two sections - Catholic and Protestant - similar to what Manitoba had prior to 1890. Each section ran its own schools and minority rights were protected, so that, the minority could establish a separate school district.[100] However, the influx of English-speaking Protestants in the 1880s to the Territories meant that the composition of the North-West Territories changed and the dual system was abolished in 1892.[101]

---

[97] Manoly R. Lupul, Relations in Education Between the State and the Roman Catholic Church in the Canadian North-West with Special Reference to the Provisional District of Alberta From 1880 to 1905 (Ph.D. dissertation) (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, 1963).

[98] Grandin to Mills, April 3, 1875, Vital Grandin Papers (Edmonton: Oblate Archives).

[99] Lupul, "Relations in Education", p. 32.

Although the dual system was abolished in favour of the Council of Public Instruction, the School Ordinance of 1892 still protected minority rights.[102] This meant that the language of instruction - English or French - was the choice of the school district and that religious instruction was still permitted at all grade levels. Yet the French Roman Catholic population continued to decrease in proportion to the English Protestant population. In 1901 the Territorial government passed another School Ordinance which consolidated centralized control in a department of education. Although minority rights were still guaranteed, for the purposes of this study, the most significant clause of the Ordinance was Section 136.2 which permitted languages other than English to be taught.[103] However, it is important to note that such instruction was limited to between the hours of three and four o'clock and was confined to the teaching of reading, composition and grammar.[104]

---

[100] The School Ordinance of the North-West Territories, 1884 in Statutes of Alberta (Edmonton).

[101] Between 1892 and 1901 separate schools could not be established in Alberta. After 1901 this was again permitted. Thus, the dual system was not completely abolished in Alberta.

[102] These rights had been initially protected under Section 11 of the North-West Territories Act.

[103] "Chapter 29 - Schools" in 1901 Ordinances: The North-West Territories (Regina, North-West Territories: John A. Reid, Government Printer, 1902), p. 33.

Although the use of languages other than English was legally permitted, albeit on a limited basis, it is clear that the goal of the government of the North-West Territories was still to assimilate and 'Canadianize' the immigrant population. The Superintendent of Education in the period prior to Alberta receiving provincial status, D.J. Goggin, established policies to fulfill this goal which made Section 136.2 all but meaningless. Goggin's policies included the hiring of teachers whose sole language was English to teach in the foreign settlement schools[105] and an insistence on properly certified teachers for all publicly-funded schools.[106] These policies made it almost impossible to have a teacher who could meet the necessary requirements and still be able to teach the 'mother tongue' of the ethnic community.

Thus, what is evident in examining the educational changes in Manitoba and the North-West Territories is that both governments made only half-hearted attempts at bilingual education. In Manitoba and the North-West Territories, education in English or any other language was permitted and even promoted until the composition of their populations shifted towards being predominantly English-speaking Protestants.[107] Once this happened, educational changes were made, so that, English became the primary language of instruction (French was still used in some separate schools in the Territories).[108] Even though both governments permitted languages other than English to be taught, they did so on a very limited basis with rather restrictive regulations.[109] Bilingual education was permitted (for a short time) but its implementation was not actively encouraged by either government.[110] However, what still remains to be determined is whether there was any substantial change in policy in Alberta after 1905.

---

[104] "Regulations of the Department of Education" in Annual Report of the Department of Education of the North-West Territories 1903 (Regina: North-West Territories: John A. Reid, Government Printer, 1904), p. 78.

[105] The tendency for immigrants was to join with other individuals of the same ethnic background and settle in what came to be known as 'bloc' settlements. It is the schools in these settlements which are referred to as 'foreign settlement schools'.

[106] Neil MacDonald, "David J. Goggin, Promoter of National Schools" in Profiles of Canadian Educators edited by R.S. Patterson, J.W. Chalmers and J.W. Friesen (Toronto: Heath, 1974).

As previously mentioned, the province of Alberta adopted the 1901 School Ordinance and the accompanying regulations as the basis for its system of education when the province was formed in 1905. Although English was the primary language of instruction, a board was permitted to offer a "primary course" in French. "The term "primary course" was never defined, though the usual practice until 1964 was to use French as a language of instruction in Grades I and II and to begin the study of "Oral French" in Grade IX."[111] In 1964 the province gave French official recognition as a language of instruction for Grades I and II provided that at least one hour a day was set aside for English as well as allowing French to be used as a language of instruction in Grade III for two hours a day and beyond Grade III for one hour a day.[112] Further changes were made in 1968 when the province allowed French to be used as a language of instruction for Grade III and above for fifty (50) per cent of the school day.[113]

---

[107] Titley, "Religion, Culture and Power", pp. 50-60.
Kach, op. cit., pp. 46-48.

[108] Titley, "Religion, Culture and Power", pp. 67-69.
"Regulations of the Department of Education" in Annual Report of the Department of Education of the North-West Territories 1903 (Regina: North-West Territories: John A. Reid, Government Printer, 1904), p. 78.

[109] Ibid.

[110] Titley, "Religion, Culture and Power", pp. 70-75.

But what did this mean for other languages? As the above indicates, French was given special treatment over other languages as a language of instruction.[114] Although the change in the composition of Alberta shows that the proportion of French-speaking people was on the decline, the French language was given special status along with English in federal and provincial legislation.[115] One possible explanation for this is the series of compromises between the British and French which eventually led to the British North America Act (1867). However, many believe that the Quiet Revolution in Quebec prompted the federal government to give the French language special status with English in order to ensure the union of Canada.[116] Regardless of the reason or the demographic reality in Alberta, the French language enjoyed the unofficial and later the official status as a language of instruction, but the same cannot be said of other minority languages.

---

[111] Manoly R. Lupul, "Minority Languages in the Alberta School System" in Report on the Conference on Multiculturalism for Canada (Edmonton: University of Alberta, Ukrainian Students' Club, August 29, 1970), p. 51.

[112] "An Act to Amend the School Act", Statutes of the Province of Alberta 1964, Chapter 82, Section 386 (Edmonton: L.S. Wall, Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1965).

[113] "An Act to Amend the School Act", Statutes of the Province of Alberta 1968, Chapter 89, Section 386 (Edmonton: L.S. Wall, Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1969).

[114] Lupul, "Minority Languages in the Alberta School System", p. 52.

[115] For example, the federal Official Languages Act (1968) which made French an official language and the Act to Amend the School Act of Alberta (1968) which permitted French to be used as a language of instruction.

The basic tenets of the province's language of instruction policy were laid down in the School Ordinance of 1901 and, subsequently, the School Act of 1905. Although there were minor changes over the years, these basic tenets were followed until 1971. As previously mentioned, these basic tenets were that instruction in any language other than English or French was limited to between the hours of three and four o'clock and confined to the teaching of reading composition and grammar.[117] The manner in which these tenets were altered had more to do with wording than with meaning, that is, the principles of limiting the use of languages other than English or French to after 'regular' instruction and of having the parents pay for this 'extra' instruction were maintained until 1971.[118]

---

[116] Kas Mazurek and Nick Kach, "Multiculturalism, Society and Education" in Canadian Education: Historical Themes and Contemporary Issues edited by E. Brian Titley (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1990), pp. 135-136.

[117] "Regulations of the Department of Education" in Annual Report of the Department of Education of the North-West Territories 1903 (Regina: North-West Territories: John A. Reid, Government Printer, 1904), p. 78.

[118] The School Act, Statutes of the Province of Alberta 1905-1971 (Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1906-1972).

It is important to point out that languages other than English and French were never given official or unofficial status as languages of instruction. This is important because members of some minority groups such as the Ukrainians believed that the Alberta government took away this 'right' in 1913.[119] However, upon closer examination, what the government did was to restrict who was permitted to teach in Section 149 of the School Act, so that, any teacher in the province had to be fluent in English.[120] The legal right to teach Ukrainian was not taken away; however, because most of the Ukrainian teachers were not fluent in English, it resulted in the dismissal of these teachers from several communities by Robert Fletcher, Supervisor of Schools for Foreigners, the Department of Education.[121] Although the end result was not having other languages taught in school, it is important to note that the Ukrainians and the other ethnic minorities did not lose the 'right' to have their language taught in school at the end of the school day.

So then how can one explain the often brutal treatment of students who attempted to use their mother language in school? Although the laws surrounding the use/instruction of languages other than English or French were never substantially altered, this does not mean that the everyday practices of teachers and the

---

[119] William A. Czumer, First Ukrainian Settlers in Canada (Edmonton: University of Alberta, The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1981).

[120] The School Act, Statutes of the Province of Alberta, Chapter 13 (Edmonton: J.W. Jeffery, Government Printer, 1914).

[121] The Eighth Annual Report of the Department of Education of the Province of Alberta 1913 (Edmonton: J.W. Jeffery, Government Printer, 1914), pp. 39-48.

Department of Education in Alberta always adhered to the regulations.[122] This, of course, does not condone the actions of teachers and the Department of Education towards students who spoke their mother language in school; however, it is an important distinction to make that the actions were not based on the School Act or the Department's regulations, but upon individual choice which may have been a result of societal consensus in favor of English as the only language in public schools.

Although the School Act and the Department of Education's regulations were not changed substantially until 1971, some minor changes occurred prior to this official change. The changes which took place prior to 1971 were mainly related to establishing second language courses instead of changes to allow languages other than English and French to be used as languages of instruction. In June 1958 "the Alberta government, following the 1952 lead of Saskatchewan, announced in an order-in-council (the issue was apparently too hot for the Legislature to handle!) that it would introduce courses in Ukrainian in Grades X, XI and XII."[123] In subsequent years, courses in German, Hungarian, Russian and Spanish were developed;[124] however, these courses never experienced widespread use. What is important to note is that, except for some private schools,[125] languages other than English or French were not used as languages of instruction during the regular school day.

---

[122] Evidence of corporal punishment being administered to students who spoke Ukrainian comes from interviews with Dr. Nick Kach and Mrs. Darlene Haverstock of the Department of Educational Foundations, University of Alberta in March 1991.

[123] Lupul, "Minority Languages in the Alberta School System", p. 53.

[124] Annual Reports of the Department of Education of the Province of Alberta 1905 - 1971 (Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1906-1972).

Thus, the Alberta government policy on languages of instruction remained fairly consistent between 1905 and 1971. The primary language of instruction over this period was English with French being the only alternative (although French was restricted to the primary level until 1964). Although, as previously mentioned, there were restrictions placed on French as a language of instruction, the use of French experienced far greater freedom than any other minority language. Thus, given this trend that can be traced between 1905 and 1971, what is(are) the explanation(s) for the official shift in 1971 which allowed for the use of any language other than English or French as a language of instruction subject to the regulations of the Department of Education?

THE HERITAGE LANGUAGE POLICY

Thus far, this chapter has examined the factors which influenced the development of the federal policy of multiculturalism and how these factors effected education. As well, this chapter has explored the policy of the Alberta government on languages of instruction over time to illustrate that a dramatic shift occurred in 1971 which allowed any language other than English or French to be used as a language of instruction. The remainder of this chapter will more closely examine this shift in policy to determine what factors influenced this shift and whether this shift was appropriate.

---

[125] There were three Ukrainian and one German private schools operating in 1970. Sixty-Fifth Annual Report of the Department of Education of the Province of Alberta, 1970 (Edmonton: L.S. Wall, Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1971), p. 70.

As discussed in the previous section, the limiting of the use of languages other than English or French was often due to factors other than legislation or regulations. The 'right' to use/instruction of languages other than English or French at the end of the school day was never taken away in the School Act or the Department of Education's regulations; thus, the problem of expanding the languages of instruction seems to be primarily a psychological one.[126] Although some saw the proposed changes to allow any language to be used as a language of instruction as simply an election ploy of the Social Credit government which was faced with likely defeat,[127] it is important to note that the policy was not officially implemented until after the Progressive Conservatives were elected in 1971. In fact, the first 'Heritage Language Program' did not begin until the fall of 1974 with Ukrainian-English bilingual pilot projects began in Edmonton Public and Separate School Districts. Nevertheless, it is important not to dismiss the political component of this shift in policy because, in 1971, 47.4 percent of the population of Alberta were people who were neither of British nor French ethnic origin.[128] With such a high percentage of Alberta's population being neither of British nor French ethnic origin, it would only make sense for the government to pay attention to the desires of this proportion of the electorate.

---

[126] Lupul, "Minority Languages in the Alberta School System", p. 57.

[127] Manoly R. Lupul, "The Politics of Ukrainian Bilingualism in Alberta" in TEMA (Saskatchewan: Saskatchewan Teachers of Ukrainian) Vol. 6, No. 1, Dec. 1974.

[128] Immigration and Population Statistics (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1974), pp. 11-12.

However, even though the political component cannot be ignored, it is important to point out that the percentage of the population of Alberta that was neither of British nor French ethnic origin had been relatively high compared to the ethnic composition of the country between 1901 and 1971.[129] The following table[130] illustrates that there has always been a significant ethnic minority in Alberta:

TABLE 1: A Comparison of the Percentage of the Population which is neither of British nor French Ethnic Origin between Alberta and Canada.

Census Year	Canada	Alberta
1901	12.25	46.02
1911	15.90	37.01
1921	16.68	34.95
1931	19.38	41.55
1941	20.05	44.43
1951	21.28	45.94
1961	25.77	48.57
1971	26.73	47.40

Before 1971 the majority of people in the province of Alberta, and indeed all of Canada, were of British or French ethnic origin. This was coupled with a desire by most immigrants to build a better life for their children which resulted in submitting to some degree to the notion of Anglo-conformity. However, once the second and third generations of the non-British, non-French immigrants had obtain an improved economic and social status, their demands for assistance in maintaining their cultures started to be heard by politicians.[131] It is important to note that although the voice of the ethnic minorities began to be heard in the 1950s resulting in the development of second languages courses, it was not until the 1960s that this voice became strong enough for more dramatic change to occur.

---

[129] Ibid.

[130] This table is based on data from Immigration and Population Statistics (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1974), pp. 11-12.

In the section on the development of the policy of multiculturalism it was shown that one of the factors which contributed to the Trudeau government's adoption of the policy in 1971 was the outrage that was displayed by the ethnic minorities over the English - French orientation of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. This outrage forced the Commission to examine the views of the non-British, non-French population and issue a fourth book based on its findings with respect to this population. At the same time that some of the ethnic groups pressured Ottawa, these same groups, most notably the Ukrainians, pressured the Alberta government for changes in its policy on languages of instruction.[132] Now it is true that the pressure from the ethnic groups helped convince the federal and Alberta governments to make changes; however, as previously mentioned, these changes could not have occurred earlier due to the composition of Canadian and Albertan society. Thus, it was simply not a matter of increased numbers which influenced the policy, but the change in the economic and social make-up of the Albertan society and the effects this change had on both politicians and the ethnic minorities.

---

[131] Burnet and Palmer, op. cit., p. 226.

[132] Interview, Peter Savaryn - member of the Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club, June 7, 1991.

Unfortunately, it is far too large an endeavour to examine the influence of all ethnic groups such as the Germans, the Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians as well as the Ukrainians; thus, for this study, the Ukrainians, who played a major role in the 1971 Amendment of the School Act, and their influence will be examined.

The Ukrainian community's voice was first heard in the late 1950s when the Department of Education allowed the Ukrainian language to be introduced as a second language course in secondary schools in 1958.[133] This was the first step in Ukrainian eventually being made a language of instruction in Edmonton in 1974.[134] However, the Ukrainian community in Edmonton, and more specifically the Ukrainian Canadian Committee and subsequently the Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club, was not satisfied with Ukrainian as a second language course.[135] The Edmonton Branch of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee presented a brief to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in which it was argued that "instruction in the Ukrainian language . . . should be integrated as an accredited subject into the existing public and separate schools . . . from the earliest grades."[136] It was through briefs such as this one that the Royal Commission concluded that where there was 'sufficient' demand, "the teaching of languages other than English and French, and the cultural subjects related to them, be incorporated as options in the public elementary school programme."[137]

---

[133] Lupul, "Minority Languages in the Alberta School System", p. 53.

[134] In the latter part of 1973 an agreement was reached between the Department of Education, the Edmonton Public and Separate School Boards and the Ukrainian community over the development and implementation of an Ukrainian-English Bilingual pilot project. The pilot project ran for three years after which an extensive evaluation was done and the project was renewed.

[135] Interview, Peter Savaryn - member of the Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club, June 7, 1991.

Although the Royal Commission stopped short of recommending that languages other than English or French should be used as languages of instruction, the above recommendation (along with others) encouraged representatives of the Ukrainian community to move ahead, but they did so cautiously. In 1970 the Ukrainian Language Association presented a brief to the Commission on Educational Planning (the Worth Commission) recommending that "the study of Ukrainian be introduced in Grade 1 and continue through Grade 12".[138] Although the Interim Proposals of the N-12 Task Force of the Worth Commission did state that "where there are enough students of a given ethnic group to make it economically feasible, the public education system should satisfy the desire of the group to have a given language taught,"[139] the immediate results from this brief were minimal. However, this did not dishearten the Ukrainian community, especially the members of the Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club which formed a Committee on Multiculturalism in 1971. The Committee was convinced that the time was ripe to push ahead with its demands and its three key members - Lawrence Decore, Manoly Lupul and Peter Savaryn - spearheaded this move.[140]

---

[136] Ukrainian Canadian Committee, "Brief to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism" (Edmonton, 1964).

[137] Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups (Volume 4) (Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, 1969), p.141.

[138] Ukrainian Language Association, "Brief to the Commission on Educational Planning" (Edmonton, 1970).

[139] Commission on Educational Planning, Interim Proposals: N-12 Education Task Force (Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1970), p. 14.

It is important to point out that even before the Committee was formed, and continuing on afterward, the Ukrainian community prepared briefs which were presented to the government and lobbied both government and opposition Members of the Legislative Assembly. Although the government was familiar with the Ukrainian proposals, the Committee prepared a new brief which was presented to the government on April 14, 1971. This brief, "The Ukrainians, The New Canadian Constitution, The Laws of Alberta and the Policies of the Government of Alberta", centered around the 1970 School Act which had removed all reference to languages other than English or French.[141] The goal was to have Ukrainian studied in grades one to twelve for at least one hour per day. This meant that there needed to be some type of clause in the School Act which permitted this. Thus, the brief recommended that the School Act be amended "to make the Ukrainian language a course of study in the schools of the

---

[140] A discussion on this issue is found in Donald Dawson, Community Power and Ethnic School Programs (Ph.D. dissertation) (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1982), pp. 109-112.

[141] The School Act, 1970 (Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1970).

Province where there is a demand for it."[142] It is important to note that this brief never specifically stated that Ukrainian should be a language of instruction because the Committee wanted to be cautious. Nevertheless, in a meeting between Premier Harry Strom, Robert Clark, Minister of Education, and Ambrose Holowach, Provincial Secretary and Decore, Lupul and Savaryn, it was made clear that it would be ideal if the government would amend the School Act to give the Ukrainian community the same treatment, with respect to language, as the French.[143] Since French could be used as a language of instruction in Grades 1 and 2 for all but one hour, and in all subsequent grades to a maximum of 50% of the school day,[144] the Ukrainian representatives desired the same treatment for their language.

To the Ukrainian delegation's surprise, the Premier promised quick action. According to Decore, whose task was to explain the need for changes in the language of instruction policy, it was an extraordinary meeting:

> After the explanation, Strom turned to Clark [Minister of Education] and asked "Is that right?" Clark replied, "Yes." Strom then asked Clark, "How long will it take to change this?" Clark replied, "Not long, a couple of weeks." Then

---

[142] Ukrainian Professionals and Businessmen's Club of Edmonton, "The Ukrainian, The New Canadian Constitution, The Laws of Alberta and the Policies of the Government of Alberta" (Edmonton, 1971), p. 6.

[143] Dawson, op. cit., p. 112.

[144] Department Regulations, Alberta Gazette (Edmonton, September 15, 1970), p. 934.

Strom told Clark, "Do it!"[145]

What followed this meeting appeared to be very quick action; however, given the backdrop of years of lobbying by the Ukrainians (and others) and recent federal developments, such as the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, it would seem that the government had already decided to move ahead with a new cultural policy. In fact, not only had the cabinet decided to develop a new cultural policy, but it was also decided that specific initiatives would be undertaken prior to the 1971 election.[146] These decisions help to explain the apparent speed with which the changes to Alberta's policy on languages of instruction were brought in. On April 24, 1971 Premier Strom addressed an audience at the eightieth anniversary celebration of Ukrainian settlement in Alberta. He made reference to the above meeting and stated that the government planned to introduce an amendment to the School Act, whereby "any board will be able to authorize for all, or any of its schools, instruction in a language other than English, all but one hour of the day for grades one and two, and all but one-half hour for grades three to twelve."[147] A few days later the "Amendment to the School Act" was given royal assent and languages other than English or French could be used as languages of instruction subject to Departmental regulations. This new policy - a Heritage Language Policy - was reaffirmed on July 16, 1971 when Premier Strom proclaimed a "New Cultural Policy for the Province of Alberta" at the first Multicultural Conference held in Alberta.

---

[145] Interview, Mr Lawrence Decore - member of the Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club, May 29, 1991.

This recollection is very similar to the one recorded by Dawson, op. cit., p. 113.

> It was the most extraordinary meeting because instead of the ministers saying, "We'll take the brief under advisement and let you know", the premier simply said to the minister of education, "Can it be done?" The minister of education said, "Yes, it can, and it can be done very quickly." Then the premier said, "Get it done."

[146] For a complete description of cabinet deliberations refer to chapter 5, pages 129-131.

Interview, Robert Clark - former Minister of Education, May 15, 1991.

Thus, minority groups such as the Ukrainians did pressure and influence the Strom government to change its policy on languages of instruction. However, there is a difference of opinion over how much influence was exerted. Manoly Lupul saw the pressure by the Ukrainian community as an essential and determining factor.[148] On the other hand, Premier Strom saw his government's actions as part of "the trend of the time, the climate, was ripe for making these changes [to the School Act, etc.] . . . The pressure came at a time when the government was very much inclined to move in that direction."[149] However, one cannot discount that 1971 was an election year and changes to the School Act were seen as an inexpensive way to gain ethnic votes.[150] Nevertheless, the question still remains: was this policy an appropriate response to the situation and how did it fit into the broader historical context?

---

[147] Harry Strom, "An Address to the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, Edmonton Branch" (Edmonton, 1971).

[148] Lupul, "The Politics of Ukrainian Bilingualism in Alberta", p. 32.

[149] This quotation is found in Dawson, op. cit., p. 116.

[150] Interview, Robert Clark - former Minister of Education, May 15, 1991. This is confirmed in Dawson, op. cit., p. 117.

SUMMARY

There can be no doubt that the 1971 Amendment to the School Act which allowed for the use of any language as a language of instruction was a dramatic shift in educational policy.[151] Previously, English was the only language of instruction due to a perceived need to assimilate and 'Canadianize' the immigrant population as well as the influence that Anglo-superiority had on the politicians and general public. However, the federal government's immigration policy (and how it changed over time) played a key role in the change in the ethnic and linguistic composition of Alberta and it was this diverse composition which laid the groundwork for the dramatic change in Alberta's policy on languages of instruction. However, as has been demonstrated, it was not simply the composition of the province's population which led to the shift in policy. One of the principal factors was a change in the economic and social make-up of Albertan society which resulted in a change of the attitudes of the anglophone as well as the non-British, non-French segments of Albertan society. It was this shift which allowed the anglophones to listen to the demands of the non-British, non-French population and which allowed the non-British, non-French citizens to be heard. The development of the ethnic minority voice, which can be seen in the development of the federal policy of multiculturalism and Alberta's policy on languages of instruction, has deep historical roots and it would not be possible to understand its development without understanding the broader historical context. This also means that it would then not be possible to understand the development of the Heritage Language Policy without an understanding of the development of the ethnic minority voice.

---

[151] Although Dr. James Hrabi, then Director of Curriculum and later Associate Deputy Minister, saw the key policy shift taking place in 1968 with the amendment which allowed French to be used as a language of instruction and the 1971 amendment as simply being an add on, Robert Clark, then Minister of Education, and Dr. T.C. Byrne, then Deputy Minister, saw the 1971 amendment as a key policy shift.

Information obtained through personal interviews in April and May 1991.

Thus, based on the development of immigration policy, the change in the ethnic and linguistic composition of Alberta and Canada and the development of the ethnic minority voice, Alberta's Heritage Language Policy could be considered an appropriate policy response. This chapter has accomplished the first major aspect of the analysis, namely, determining the appropriateness of the policy given the broader historical context. This leaves the second major aspect of the analysis - determining whether and how the policy-makers used history in the development of the policy - for the next chapter.[152] [153]

---

[152]

[153]

CHAPTER 5

THE USE OF HISTORY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HERITAGE LANGUAGE POLICY

INTRODUCTION

In the preceding chapters the groundwork was laid for an analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta. The rationale for using history as the tool for analysis was described and need not be repeated here; however, it is important to note, once again, that history does have a role in the analysis of public policy. Namely, history can be used to determine whether a specific policy was an appropriate response and whether and how policy-makers used history in the development of a policy. In the last chapter the Heritage Language Policy was placed in the broader historical context to determine whether it could be considered an appropriate response to the changing make-up of Canadian and, subsequently, Albertan society. Through the examination of federal immigration and multicultural policies and their effect on education, it was determined that the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta could be considered appropriate according to the criteria set down in chapter four. However, what still remains to be determined is whether and how the policy-makers used history in the development of this specific policy.

But why is it important to determine whether and how the policy-makers used history in the development of this policy? Has it not already been determined that the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta was an appropriate response given the historical development of the policy problem? Many different factors influence policy-makers with their decisions; thus, it is important to determine why the policy-makers considered this policy as appropriate because this will lead to a better understanding of what the policy-makers used in their decision-making. For this study, the one factor of interest is whether and how the policy-makers used history in the development of this policy. The answer to this question will also make it possible to suggest ways that the proper use of history could have improved this policy-making process.

In May 1984 the Multiculturalism Directorate of the Department of the Secretary of State brought together twenty-five academics "to discuss the current state of research on heritage language issues and to define priorities for future research funding."[1] Two of the major reasons why the Heritage Language Research Conference was organized was the rapid increase in the provision of heritage language instruction and "the fact that there appeared to be little research information available to guide the decisions of policy makers, educators, and community groups with respect to this provision."[2] If this was true in 1984, how much more so in 1971 when Alberta changed its School Act to allow for instruction in languages other than English or French.[3] With little or no research available to the government policy-makers in Alberta, the question which begs to be answered is: What was their decision based on? As has been previously mentioned, any attempt to fully answer this question is far too grandiose; thus, this chapter will focus on one aspect of this question: Did the policy-makers use history in their decision-making and if so, how was it used?

---

[1] Jim Cummins (editor). Heritage Languages in Canada: Research Perspectives. (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1984), p. 1.

[2] Ibid.

[3] The School Act, 1971, Section 150 (Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1971).

REVIEW OF THE "MODIFIED TECHNIQUES"

As discussed in chapter three, Neustadt and May argue that policy-makers can more clearly define their concerns and objectives with or without the use of history (the past); however, since most policy-makers use history or what they think to be history it becomes clear that the proper use of history has a role in more clearly defining the concerns and objectives of policy-makers. Thus, their "mini-methods" were adapted into the "Modified Techniques" to help determine whether and how the policy-makers used history in the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta. What follows is a review of the "Modified Techniques" and then their application in the analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy.

To begin the process, it is important to discover whether the policy-makers used history when they defined the immediate situation to clarify their concerns and objectives. The "Known-Unclear-Presumed/Likenesses-Differences" or the "K-U-P/L-D" technique can help determine whether there were any analogies which could have led to parallels being drawn from the past and if there were then it could help to use them properly. Thus, for this study, the first step was to determine whether analogies/parallels were used by the policy-makers to determine the problem and what their concerns should be. If this proved to be the case then the next step was to discover if the policy-makers clarified the immediate situation and any analogies/parallels by determining what was Known, Unclear and Presumed about both. The final step was to discover if the policy-makers compared their analogies with the immediate situation to determine whether the analogies were used appropriately or led to a misunderstanding of the immediate situation and a misreading of future trends.

However, there are two other techniques that were used to further determine whether and how history was used in the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta. The second technique is called "Issue History" which is the combination of the Goldberg Rule, Time-lines and Journalists' questions. It is not essential that the policy-makers involved in the Heritage Language Policy used any or all of the three techniques. What is important, for this study, is did the policy-makers take the time to ask "what's the story?" to examine the policy on languages of instruction and how and why the policy changed over time. Thus, what was examined was whether the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy used these or other techniques to produce an issue history - an understanding of the development of the policy problem - to help them refine their concerns and thus, their objectives and options. This was determined by examining published and unpublished government documents, such as Departmental memoranda and cabinet documents, as well as conducting personal interviews with key department and government officials to see what evidence exists of issue history being used in the development of this policy.

The final technique is called "Placement". Here again, it is not essential that the policy-makers involved in the Heritage Language Policy used all of the techniques suggested in chapter three. What is important, for this study, is to determine whether the policy-makers attempted to gain a better understanding of the interests and possible reactions of the special interest groups (e.g. the Ukrainians) and the federal government. Once again, this was done by examining published and unpublished government documents and conducting personal interviews with key participants (department and government officials and members of a specific ethnic community) involved with the development of this policy to see if there was any evidence of "placement" being used to help refine stereotypes which could help the policy-makers determine the most appropriate course of action.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE POLICY

Before the "Modified Techniques" can be applied to the development of the Heritage Language Policy, it is necessary to go into more detail on how the policy was developed than was done in chapter four. In chapter four it was demonstrated that the 1971 Amendment to the School Act, which allowed for the use of any language as a language of instruction, was a dramatic shift in educational policy.[4] This dramatic shift occurred because of a combination of factors such as the development of federal immigration and multicultural policies in the 1960s, the change in the ethnic and linguistic composition of Alberta and Canada and the development of an ethnic minority voice.

The political component of this shift was played down, but it was not ignored. As discussed in chapter four, some saw the proposed changes to allow any language to be used as a language of instruction as simply an election ploy of the Social Credit government which was faced with likely defeat. However, it was more complex than a simple election strategy.[5] Before 1971 the majority of people in Alberta did not understand the need to expand the number of languages of instruction. However, once the second and third generations of the non-British, non-French immigrants had obtained higher economic and social status, their demands for assistance in maintaining their cultures started to be heard by the politicians.[6] Thus, it was simply not a matter of increased numbers which influenced the policy, but the change in the economic and social make-up of the Albertan society and the effects this change had on both politicians and ethnic minorities. It only made sense for the government to pay attention to the desires of this proportion of the electorate.

---

[4] Although Dr. James Hrabi, former Director of Curriculum and Associate Deputy Minister, saw the key policy shift taking place in 1968 with the amendment which allowed French to be used as a language of instruction and the 1971 amendment as simply being an add on. Robert Clark, former Minister of Education, and Dr. T.C. Byrne, former Deputy Minister, saw the 1971 amendment as a key policy shift. Information obtained through personal interviews in April and May 1991.

[5] The phrase 'election strategy' was chosen in order not to appear judgmental. Several of the individuals interviewed for this study used the term 'ploy' because they saw the government's action as an attempt to gain the ethnic vote.

[6] Jean R. Burnet and Howard Palmer, Coming Canadians: An Introduction to a History of Canada's People (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Inc., 1988), p. 226.

Minority groups such as the Ukrainians (their involvement was detailed in chapter four) did influence and pressure the Strom government to change its policy on languages of instruction. However, as previously stated, there was a difference of opinion over how much influence was exerted. Manoly Lupul saw the pressure by the Ukrainian community as an essential and determining factor.[7] On the other hand, Premier Strom saw his government's actions as part of "the trend of the time, the climate, was ripe for making these changes [to the School Act, etc.] . . . The pressure came at a time when the government was very much inclined to move in that direction."[8] Regardless of how much pressure was exerted, it is clear that the shift in policy had a political component to it. But how was the policy actually developed?

According to Robert Clark, the Minister of Education (1968 - 1971), the government was influenced by pressure from within the government and from outside the government. This pressure focused on the need for a new cultural policy in response to the federal government policy on bilingualism and the upcoming policy on multiculturalism.[9] There was federal money for each of these areas, especially the teaching of French in the province's school systems, which the government wanted to access. This meant that the government needed to change some of its policies in areas such as education; however, at the same time, there also was pressure from members of the government not to give the French language any special status.[10] This was coupled with the fear of the other ethnic groups that they would have to become either English or French-speaking. But, instead of being disheartened, some ethnic groups "saw that there was a political opportunity to preserve their cultures and heritages."[11] In fact, "the Cabinet was persuaded by the representatives of the ethnic community(s) that if something was not done their unique contribution to the cultural life of Alberta would be lost."[12] Thus, with pressure from within and outside the government, the Strom cabinet decided to take the initiative on developing a new cultural policy for Alberta.

---

[7] Manoly R. Lupul, "The Politics of Ukrainian Bilingualism in Alberta" in TEMA (Saskatchewan: Saskatchewan Teachers of Ukrainian) Vol. 6, No. 1, Dec. 1974.

[8] This quotation is found in Donald Dawson, Community Power and Ethnic School Programs (Ph.D. dissertation) (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1982), p. 116.

Once the cabinet had made the decision to design a new cultural policy for Alberta, the task of writing this new policy was given to Owen Anderson (Special Assistant to Premier Harry Strom), John Barr (Executive Assistant to Robert Clark) and Don Hamilton

---

[9] For an example of how one ethnic group pressured the government, see chapter four for a detailed account of the Ukrainian influence.

[10] Interview, Ray Speaker - former Social Credit cabinet minister, May 24, 1991.

[11] Interview, Robert Clark - former Minister of Education, May 15, 1991.

[12] Ibid.

(Executive Assistant to Premier Harry Strom).[13] These three men then proceeded to draft the new policy and present it to cabinet. Although the cabinet now had the makings of a general policy underway, it was an election year and there needed to be some initiatives that would come out of this general policy. Thus, the cabinet directed the Minister of Education along with a few other ministers to develop more specific policies. The Minister of Education was directed to develop a policy related to languages of instruction.[14]

With this direction from cabinet, the Minister of Education met with his Deputy, Dr. Timothy Byrne, to instruct him to draft legislation regarding languages of instruction. At one of their meetings, the Minister of Education recalled his Deputy stating that "the decision has already been made, hasn't it."[15] The importance of this remark is that the policy was never sent to the Department for study or development. The Department did not conduct any studies into the implications of this shift in policy. That is, the ramifications of this new policy, which would have included changes in such areas as curriculum development and teacher education, were never considered. In fact, the Associate Director of Curriculum, Dr. Philip Lamoureux, who was in charge of language curriculum was never consulted about the proposed change to the

---

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

School Act.[16] The amendment to the School Act was developed by Dr. Byrne and discussed briefly at the Director's Council (a meeting of the heads of all the sections in the Department of Education).[17] It was then discussed with the Minister of Education who then brought the proposed amendment to the cabinet. There was little or no discussion concerning the amendment as the cabinet was in general agreement on the need to bring some changes to Alberta's cultural policies.[18] Thus, with cabinet approval, the Minister of Education brought the amendment to the Legislative Assembly on April 16, 1971. Not only was there very little disagreement over the policy in cabinet, the Minister of Education recalled that there was very little concern or disagreement expressed by the Progressive Conservative opposition in the Legislative Assembly before the amendment was passed into law on April 26, 1971.[19] However, the question which still needs to be answered is: did the policy-makers use history in this process?

---

[16] Interview, Dr. P.A. Lamoureux - former Associate Director of Curriculum, April 22,1991.

[17] Interview, Dr. T.C. Byrne - former Deputy Minister, April 23, 1991.

[18] Interviews, Ray Speaker and Fred Colborne - former Social Credit cabinet ministers in 1971, May 24, 1991.

[19] A partial explanation for the lack if opposition is that the ethnic groups, especially the Ukrainians, had been working to win the Progressive Conservatives over to their side. With an election in the near future it was advantageous for the opposition to support the amendment.

Information obtained through personal interview with Lawrence Decore - member of the Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club, May 29, 1991.

THE USE OF HISTORY

The answer to this question - did the policy-makers use history in the development of the Heritage Language Policy - is the first step in the application of the "Modified Techniques" because the use of these techniques is predicated on the policy-makers using history. Thus, once this question has been answered it will then be possible to move on to the actual application of the "Modified Techniques" in order to demonstrate the proper use of history.

However, a few general comments are required before it is determined whether and how the policy-makers used history. In chapter one, as in subsequent discussions, it was stated that published and unpublished government documents would be used in this analysis. Although these sources were examined, it is very important to note that there was no written correspondence in the form of briefings or memoranda between the Minister of Education and his Deputy Minister. Both Clark and Byrne had very fond recollections of their relationship and agreed that most, if not all, of their communication was done verbally.[20] Thus, there were no documents from either of these principals that could shed light on their use of history. In addition, before 1971, according to Ray Speaker (a former cabinet colleague of Clark) cabinet meetings were very informal, that is, there were no pre-planned agendas and no formal notification of what was to be discussed.[21] This also meant that no formal minutes were recorded and that it was up to each minister to take his/her own notes. Once again this meant that there were very few cabinet documents to work from. The result of these limitations was that the personal interviews with cabinet ministers, departmental officials and influential members of the Ukrainian community provided the majority of the evidence for determining whether and how history was used in the development of the Heritage Language Policy.

---

[20] Interviews, Robert Clark - former Minister of Education, May 15, 1991 and Dr. T.C. Byrne - former Deputy Minister of Education, April 23, 1991.

[21] Interview, Ray Speaker - former Social Credit cabinet minister, May 24, 1991.

The answer to the question - did the policy-makers use history in their decision-making process - is YES. The policy-makers used history in the development of the policy; however, their use of history was very limited. It was based on what the policy-makers believed had happened in the past not on any formal historical research. In fact, the policy-makers' understanding of the past centered around an untested assumption which was that the ethnic groups, who had made important contributions to the development and life of Alberta, would lose their heritage and identity if something was not done, and if this happened the result would be a loss to the cultural life of Alberta. This assumption was reinforced by the representatives of the Ukrainian community, especially Manoly Lupul and Peter Savaryn, who put forward historical "facts" to the government[22] to support this assumption. These historical "facts" included the Ukrainian contribution to the development and life of Alberta, the provision for the use of languages other than

---

[22] Interview, Peter Savaryn - member of the Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club of Edmonton, June 7, 1991.

English in the early 1900s and that a language instruction must begin at an early age in order for satisfactory language acquisition to occur.[23]

These "facts" or arguments were presented to both the Premier and the Minister of Education who expressed regret for the injustices of the past.[24] In doing so, neither Strom nor Clark questioned the accuracy of the information presented by the representatives of the Ukrainian community. The result was that the assumption, and the data used to support it, were not challenged by the government. In fact, the government did not conduct any formal historical research into the development of the policy problem, that is, there was no historical research done on the development of Alberta's policy on languages of instruction. In addition, there was no historical research done to determine whether there existed any parallels in other part of Canada in regard to bilingual education. The Minister of Education did not request any historical research be done in order to give background to the policy problem, to uncover any possible parallels or to confirm the information supplied by the representatives of the Ukrainian community.[25] In fact, the senior officials at the Department of Education who were interviewed did not recall doing any type of research related to this policy.[26] As previously stated, Byrne, the Deputy Minister, correctly perceived that the decision had already been made and the only task left was to draft the legislation. Thus, there was no historical research done by the government in connection with the Heritage Language Policy.

---

[23] Ibid.

[24] This regret was expressed at a meeting between Strom, Clark and Holowach and Decore, Lupul and Savaryn in April 1971.
Information obtained through interview with Peter Savaryn - member of the Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club, June 7, 1991.

[25] Interview, Robert Clark - former Minister of Education, May 15, 1971.

At this point, it is important to note that the Heritage Language Policy was only one part of a broader cultural policy. Nevertheless, Clark thought that there was probably no research done and if any had been done then a certain amount of poetic license was probably used in the drafting of the general cultural policy.[27] Clark's perception is not totally accurate. In the general cultural policy of 1971, entitled "A New Cultural Policy for the Province of Alberta",[28] it is evident that some historical research was done. However, the depth of this research was very shallow. The references and statements made about the past were very general and vague. For example, there was mention of the changing nature of the ethnic and linguistic composition of Canada and, subsequently, Alberta; however, it was very general. The section on education made reference to present practices and how the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism along with the efforts of the

---

[26] Information obtained through personal interviews with Dr. P.A. Lamoureux, former Associate Director of Curriculum; Dr. James Hrabi, former Director of Curriculum; and Dr. T.C. Byrne, former Deputy Minister in April and May 1991.

[27] Ibid.

[28] This policy statement was delivered by Premier Strom at a multicultural conference on July 16, 1971.

Ukrainian community had led to changes in the School Act,[29] but the focus was on contemporary events with little concern over what had gone before. Specific references to the past began with 1966 which was five years before the policy was developed. Thus, even with the broader cultural policy there had been very limited historical research.

Both in the development of the broader cultural policy and the Heritage Language Policy the historical research done by the policy-makers was very limited. The policy-makers' use of history was based on what they believed had happened in the past which centered around an untested assumption which, once again, was that the ethnic groups, who had made important contributions to the development and life of Alberta, would lose their heritage and identity if something was not done. If this happened the result would be a loss to the cultural life of Alberta.. This assumption was then reinforced by "facts" which were never questioned. In fact, the government, more specifically the cabinet, did not request historical or any other type of research to support this assumption or confirm the "facts" such as the certainty that if something was not done to preserve ethnic languages then cultures would be extinguished. Clark and some of his cabinet colleagues assumed that some basic research was done but never requested nor used it in their decision. The aforementioned assumption was simply accepted with no serious doubts or questions being raised.[30] The cabinet simply assumed that in the past ethnic groups had lost their cultural identity (e.g. the American melting pot) and they did not want the same to happen in Alberta to ethnic groups who had made important contributions to the development and life of Alberta.[31] Thus, based on the cabinet's belief about the ethnic groups' contributions to Alberta and what they thought had happened to ethnic groups in the past, the government decided to take some initiatives, so that, Alberta would not lose the 'multicultural' aspect of its life which would ultimately mean a loss in quality of life.[32] What this means is that the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy did not understand the proper use of history and thus, did not use the "Modified Techniques" or any similar techniques to more clearly define their concerns and objectives and support their policy strategy.

---

[29] Government of Alberta, "A New Cultural Policy for the Province of Alberta", July 16, 1971.

[30] Interview, Robert Clark - former Minister of Education, May 15, 1991.

APPLICATION OF THE "MODIFIED TECHNIQUES"

Thus, what the above discussion of the policy-making process reveals is that there was very little historical research done on the Heritage Language Policy before it was taken to the Legislative Assembly as an amendment to the School Act. But could history have assisted in the development of the policy?

Given this general understanding of the process of the development of the Heritage Language Policy, it is now possible to apply the "Modified Techniques" to demonstrate how the proper use of history could have assisted in the development of this policy. It is important to point out that there will be no attempt to demonstrate that the policy should not have been developed for the reasons previously discussed. Nor will this section be an exhaustive display of how history could have been used. Instead this section will simply apply the "K-U-P/L-D", the "Issue History" and the "Placement" techniques to the Heritage Language Policy to demonstrate how the proper use of history could have assisted in its development.

---

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

As previously stated, the government's decision to develop a new cultural policy for Alberta and, subsequently the Heritage Language Policy, centered around the untested assumption that the ethnic groups, who had made important contributions to the development and life of Alberta, would lose their heritage and identity if something was not done and if this happened the result would be a lose to the cultural life of Alberta. This assumption had two parts: first, that the ethnic groups of Alberta had made some significant contribution to the development and cultural life of the province and second, that the ethnic groups would lose their cultural identity if something was not done. It would have been possible for the policy-makers to have done, or more probably have done for them, research which could have determined the validity of each part of this assumption. Would this type of research had changed their decision? Of course, it is difficult to know; however, given the political climate and the fact that an election was only months away, it would seem unlikely. Then what difference would the research have made? Through the course of the research it is highly probable that some parallels concerning bilingual education and its necessity for cultural survival would have surfaced. As part of this research it would have been possible to determine what the implications of this shift in policy would be. This research would have revealed some of the educational elements, such as curriculum development, which would have required attention in order for the policy to be effectively implemented. For example, this research could have been based on the Manitoba experience (1897-1916) and Alberta's own experience in the early 1900s. It might have shown that areas such as curriculum development and teacher education would have had to undergo dramatic changes in order for the policy to be effective. Of course, this information would not necessarily have changed the policy decision, but it might have given the policy-makers reason to modify or place conditions on the policy. Changes such as these would be classified as marginal improvements.

Thus, some general historical research could have assisted the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy to determine the implications of the shift in policy. But, what about the "Modified Techniques", how could they have assisted the policy-makers? The "Modified Techniques" or similar techniques could have been applied to this policy problem in order for the policy-makers to clarify their concerns and objectives. This clarification would have centered around the untested assumption previously mentioned. What follows are examples of how the "Modified Techniques" could have been used to clarify the assumption and the policy-makers concerns and objectives.

The "K-U-P/L-D" technique was designed to allow policy-makers a mechanism to clarify their concerns and objectives for specific policy issues/problems. Thus, the first step for the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy would have been to distinguish what was "Known", what was "Unclear" and what was "Presumed" about the policy problem. Once this was done then the next step would have been to compare the present situation with any other from the past which came to mind. This comparison would have been accomplished by outlining what the "Likenesses" and "Differences" were which would have further clarified the policy-makers' concerns and objectives.

How could the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy have proceeded? The first step would have been to list what was known, unclear and presumed:

*1. Known: a) At present, only English and French (to a limited degree) could be used as languages of instruction in publicly-funded schools.

b) That the ethnic groups who were neither of British nor French origin were upset over the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (Books I - III, 1967) and the special status afforded the French language. However, these ethnic groups supported the fourth book of the Royal Commission which came out in 1969 which suggested government action in the preservation of language and culture.

c) That these ethnic groups, especially the Ukrainians, wanted the same language rights afforded Francophones in publicly-funded schools in Alberta.

d) That the government was developing a new broader cultural policy to recognize the other ethnic groups.

e) That an election was only months away and the government desired to win the favour of these ethnic groups.

2. Unclear: a) The extent to which language and culture were linked.

b) What the implications of this shift in policy were.

3. Presumed: a) That the other ethnic groups had made an important contribution to the life of Alberta.

b) That if something was not done the other ethnic groups would lose their heritage and language which would result in a lose to the cultural life of Alberta.

If the policy-makers had done this, they would have be able to identify the areas where research was needed. This research could have included a historical study on the contributions of the other ethnic groups which could have supported the first part of the assumption that influenced the government's decision. As well, a study on whether over time ethnic groups had lost their heritage and identity could have either supported or refuted the second part of the assumption which said that ethnic groups would lose their heritage and identity. This study could have included an examination of this phenomenon over the first sixty-five years of the province or even back to the first large scale immigration in the 1890s when Alberta was still part of the North-West Territories. Of course, part of this research would have been non-historical in nature and could have dealt with the link between language and culture.[33] And finally, research could have been done to explore what the implications of this shift in policy would have been. But how could this have been done?

These three areas of research also involve the second aspect of the "K-U-P/L-D" technique. The policy-makers and/or researchers could have brainstormed to see what analogies and/or parallels from the past came to mind. Then research could have shown what were the likenesses and differences between the present situation and the past. For example, in connection with defining concerns and objectives, the American or French public schooling experience might have been examined as examples of unilingual schooling. In both nations it was considered essential to teach a common language (in the United States - English and in France - Parisian French) and this was the pattern followed by other provinces such as Ontario.[34] However, it would have become evident that this notion of unilingual instruction had not been as strictly enforced in Alberta where a primary course in French had been allowed. Although other languages could be used, the limitations placed on their use made the system essentially unilingual. Nevertheless, the policy-makers would have discovered historical precedents for the introduction of languages other than English or French as languages of instruction, which would have supported the provincial government's decision.

---

[33] For example, see the discussion concerning the link between language and culture in Dawson, op. cit., pp. 12 - 19. This discussion reviews the work of several experts in the field and reveals that there was (and still is) no conclusive evidence to support or refute the existence of a close link between language and culture. The non-historical research could have been a literature review.

[34] Robert J. Carney, "Going to School in Upper Canada" in Canadian Education: Historical Themes and Contemporary Issues edited by E. Brian Titley (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1990), pp. 31-37.

Another example of how the "K-U-P/L-D" technique could have been used is found in connection with the third area of research concerning the implications of this shift in policy. An examination of other bilingual schooling experiences/experiments such as what took place in Manitoba (1897-1916) and Alberta's own experience in the early 1900s could have served several purposes. By comparing these past experiences in Alberta and Manitoba with present day Alberta it would have been possible to see the likenesses and differences in areas such as concerns and objectives or implications of a shift in policy. The examination of Alberta in the early 1900s would have revealed the difficulties and costs associated with curriculum development and teacher qualifications. These areas of difficulties would have been reinforced by an examination of the experience in Manitoba. Thus, this research would have revealed that, in areas such as curriculum development and teacher education, there would be changes needed in order for this shift in Alberta policy to be effective.

Would the use of the "K-U-P/L-D" technique have changed the policy-makers' decision? Probably not given the political climate which was more favourable to linguistic diversity and the fact that an election was only months away; however, it would have clarified the issue and the policy-makers' concerns and objectives which might have led to a modified policy. Thus, the use of the "K-U-P/L-D" technique might have led to some marginal improvements in the Heritage Language Policy. That is all that could be expected. But, what about the other two "Modified Techniques"?

The second technique is called "Issue History" which is the combination of the Goldberg Rule, Time-lines and Journalists' questions. When this technique was used in determining whether the policy-makers used history in the development of the Heritage Language Policy, it was not essential that the policy-makers used any or all of the three techniques. What was important was to determine if the policy-makers took the time to ask "what's the story?" to examine the policy on languages of instruction and how and why the policy changed over time. As previously stated, the policy-makers did not take the time to produce an issue history - an understanding of the development of the policy problem - to help them refine their concerns and thus, their objectives and options. What would have an issue history have done for the policy-makers?

If the policy-makers would have taken the time to have done, or more probably have done for them, a history of the policy problem it would have become apparent that a dramatic shift in policy was being proposed. What could the issue history have consisted of? The first part could have been a review of the policy and how and why it changed, such as the one presented in chapter four, starting with the language of instruction policy in Ontario and Quebec to show the roots of the North-West Territories' and, subsequently, Alberta's policy. The policy-makers would have discovered that up until 1968 the province had had an English only policy for the language of instruction except for the primary course in French. Yet this discovery would have been coupled with the rationale behind the policy which was the need to assimilate and 'Canadianize' the immigrant and indigenous population. This review would also have allowed the policy-makers to see the change in attitude of both the dominant Anglo majority and the other ethnic groups as a result of the change in economic and social status for some members of the other ethnic groups. This change in status would also have indicated that the majority of ethnic groups had become part of Canadian and, subsequently, Albertan society. In addition, this change in status would have demonstrated that indeed the other ethnic groups had made important contributions to Alberta and were now in a position to influence the government.[35] Thus, this type of issue history would have provide the policy-makers with much needed information on the background of the policy problem.

A time-line which summarized the important information in a condensed, visual form might not have been necessary; however, given the time constraints under which the policy-makers operated in April 1971, it would have allowed the policy-makers to glean the important information at a glance instead of reading a lengthy paper. In fact, the use of a time-line and some concisely answered Journalists' questions based on the review might have offered the policy-makers all the information they would have needed to better understand the policy problem and some of the factors involved in it. Thus, this review could have been accompanied by a time-line for easier access to the information such as the significant policy changes, the major immigration periods and federal initiatives (e.g. the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism) to show how these factors overlapped. The researcher(s) could also have asked the Journalists' questions; however, the answer to most of these questions would be found in the review and the supporting time-line. This combination of time-line and journalists' questions would have given the policy-makers much needed background information.

---

[35] This is a summary of the more detailed account found in chapter 4.

Regardless of whether a lengthy review or a combination of a time-line and Journalists' questions were used, the policy-makers would have gained a better understanding of where Alberta was and how it got there in relation to the policy on languages of instruction. This type of issue history would have shown the policy-makers that such a dramatic shift in policy had not been possible until then. It would also have shown the policy-makers that provincial school jurisdictions were not equipped to deal with such major changes in schooling. This would have meant that the policy-makers would have had studies (such as the one suggested above) done on the implications for this shift in policy. In addition, this technique could have provided the policy-makers with information concerning other factors, such as the rise of an ethnic voice, which would influence their decision. Would this information have changed the policy-makers' decision? Probably not. In fact, it might have lent additional support to the decision to allow any language to be used as a language of instruction. But regardless of whether additional support was gained or not, this technique would have allowed the policy-makers to further clarify the issue and their concerns and objectives.

The final technique called "Placement" was designed to sophisticate the stereotypes that policy-makers work with. Most, if not all, policy-makers use generalizations concerning the participants involved in a specific policy problem. These generalizations form stereotypes which are used in policy decisions. Although the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy had their own stereotypes, they did not attempt to sophisticate the generalizations which built their stereotypes. Some of the generalizations involved ethnic groups and the federal government. The policy-makers had separated the French from the other ethnic groups and then lumped all the latter together, so that, there was supposedly a unified ethnic voice. In addition, the policy-makers had stereotyped the federal government as pro-French (pro-bilingualism) and anti-other ethnic groups (anti-multiculturalism). Could using the "Placement" technique have sophisticated these stereotypes? Yes.

It is important to point out that of all the "Modified Techniques" the most difficult to use is the "Placement" technique. Not only does "Placement" require research into the historical background of each participant, but it also requires cross-checking information to collaborate what is being used to form the stereotypes. Nevertheless, the "Placement" technique could have assisted the policy-makers involved in the development of the

Heritage Language Policy in sophisticating their generalizations concerning the ethnic groups and the federal government.

By attempting to 'place' the different ethnic groups it would have become apparent that there were both similarities and differences with their experiences in Alberta. In addition, understanding the background of each group might have allowed the policy-makers to discover that not all ethnic groups were concerned or interested in heritage languages. This would have allowed the policy-makers a better chance to judge the size of the unified ethnic voice. This could have been coupled with more contemporary investigation which would have uncovered whether there was an unified voice at all. This investigation would have revealed that the Ukrainian community had the general support of other ethnic groups such as the German, Jewish, Scandinavian and even the French communities.[36] This type of information would not only have allowed the policy-makers to sophisticate their generalizations concerning the ethnic voice, but it would have allowed them some insight into which groups might have wanted to take advantage of the new legislation. This would have assisted in a better understanding of the implications of the policy and might have led to some type of modification or qualification (e.g. this policy might have been implemented on a trial basis).

In addition to sophisticating the stereotype related to the ethnic groups, the policy-makers could have clarified their stereotype concerning the federal government. This could have included an examination of the development of the idea of multiculturalism (such as the one presented in chapter four) in order to determine the federal government's commitment to this idea. It is important to remember that the policy of multiculturalism had not yet been articulated or proclaimed by the federal government. Nevertheless, it would have been possible to discover whether the federal government was genuinely committed to the idea of multiculturalism. This information could have done two things: first, it would have altered the policy-makers stereotype concerning the federal government and second, it would have assisted in the considerations regarding the implications of the Heritage Language Policy.

---

[36] Interview, Lawrence Decore - member of the Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club of Edmonton, May 29, 1991.

Would the sophistication of the policy-makers generalizations of participants, such as the ethnic groups and the federal government, have changed the policy decision? No. However, using the "Placement" technique would have given the policy-makers a better understanding of who was interested in the policy and how their interest could affect the policy. Basically, the "Placement" technique would have allowed the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy to make better judgements when it came to the implications of the policy.

SUMMARY

The fundamental question which still needs to be answered is: would the "Modified Techniques" have changed the Heritage Language

Policy of Alberta? The answer appears to be yes. The application of the "Modified Techniques" would not have stopped the provincial government from announcing this new policy; however, if the policy-makers had applied these or any similar techniques, they would have been rewarded with marginal, and not so marginal, improvements. The marginal improvements would have appeared in the way the policy-makers had defined their concerns and objectives. These techniques would have allowed the policy-makers to more clearly define: a) why the languages of instruction policy was important.

b) which groups were involved.

c) who would be affected by the new policy.

d) how they would be affected.

These marginal improvements might have caused the policy-makers to make slight modifications to the wording of the policy.

However, there is one area in which the "Modified Techniques" might have caused some serious re-thinking. This re-thinking would not necessarily have resulted in the rejection of the policy, but it might have caused some qualifications or restrictions to be placed on it. When the provincial government announced that any language could be used as a language of instruction, the policy-makers had no real idea what the implications of this policy were. The Minister of Education did not envision any large scale changes in classroom practices.[37] In fact, in hindsight, Premier Strom stated that "the setting up of extensive school programs was really not thought of at that time."[38] In addition, it is important to recall that some of the senior Department of Education officials, who could have given some valuable insights into the implications of this policy, were never brought into the development process.[39] Thus, the policy-makers never considered what the implementation of this policy would entail.

---

[37] Interview, Robert Clark - former Minister of Education, May 15, 1991.

If the "Modified Techniques" had been applied the policy-makers would have had a much better understanding of the implications of the Heritage Language Policy. They would have been able to more accurately determine how many ethnic groups would have wanted to participate (the "Placement" technique). Which would have assisted the policy-makers in more accurately determining the extent to which areas such as curriculum development, program access and teacher education (the "K-U-P/L-D" technique) would have been affected. Once again, if the policy-makers had access to this information it does not mean that they would have rejected the Heritage Language Policy. In fact, given the political climate which was more favourable to linguistic diversity and the fact that an election was pending, the decision would probably have been the same. However, the use of the "Modified Techniques" would have allowed the policy-makers to better prepare for the implementation of the policy which might have included some type of modifications or restrictions. The failure to properly examine the implications of the policy left the policy open to criticism and other difficulties. The most recent criticism has been leveled by the Reform Party (a new political party established in Western Canada) and the participants in the Spicer Commission on Canadian unity (this Commission travelled across Canada and heard the views of over 300,000 Canadians). The criticism was directed at the general policy of multiculturalism and its accompanying language policies which include Alberta's Heritage Language Policy. The use of the "Modified Techniques" might have alleviated some of the concerns being presently expressed by Canadians. In addition, it might have assisted the policy-makers to anticipate the implications of a loss of federal funds which has recently occurred. Thus, the "Modified Techniques" would have brought, at least, marginal improvements to the development of the Heritage Language Policy.

---

[38] This quotation is found in: Dawson, op. cit., p. 150.

[39] Information obtained through personal interviews with Dr. P.A. Lamoureux, former Associate Director of Curriculum; Dr. James Hrabi, former Director of Curriculum; and Dr. T.C. Byrne, former Deputy Minister in April and May 1991.

CONCLUSIONS

The basis for this study has been the notion that the proper use of history in the public policy-making process is an essential ingredient to the process and that it is often overlooked. It was argued in chapters two and three that history is used by public policy-makers and that most of the policy-makers involved in the public policy-making process use history badly. This assertion was made by Neustadt and May in connection with policy-makers involved in macropolicy (policy at a national or international level); however, their evidence came solely in the form of case studies of

American national (domestic) and foreign policy as well as anecdotal evidence from their own experience and the experience of their students. However, they presented no evidence to support this assertion in connection with micropolicy (policy at a provincial/state or local level) nor was it clear whether this assertion was valid for policy-makers in other countries, such as Canada, involved with either macropolicy or micropolicy.

Thus, the remainder of this study set out to determine the appropriateness of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta and whether and how the policy-makers involved in the development of this policy - a Canadian provincial policy - used history. The purpose was twofold: first, to determine whether the Heritage Language Policy was indeed an appropriate response given the broader historical context which included the change in the composition of Canadian and, subsequently, Albertan society and the implementation of the federal government's policy of multiculturalism in the early 1970s. And second, to determine whether Neustadt and May's notions about the uses of history in the public policy-making process were only for macropolicy in the United States or whether they could be applied in Canada and at the 'micro level'.

The first task was to determine the basis for using history in the public policy-making process. In order to accomplish this, it was necessary to determine what qualities history would need to be part of this process. Through exploring the notion of history over time it was discovered that there were two primary qualities which had competed for primacy: accuracy and relevance. Instead of either one of these qualities having primacy, it was determined that history needed to be both accurate and relevant if it was to be used in the public policy-making process. Once the primary qualities of history - accuracy and relevance - had been decided upon, it was necessary to discuss some of the problems related to history. This was done in order to help make policy-makers aware of these problems and how to avoid them. With this understanding of history and the nature of historical research, it was then possible to develop a methodology to be used in determining whether the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta was an appropriate policy response and whether and how the policy-makers involved in the development of this policy used history and what the implications of this could be.

In chapter three, it was determined that by tracing the development of the Heritage Language Policy, it would be possible to place the policy problem into the broader historical context which would then allow for an evaluation of the policy's appropriateness. The methodology that was designed for this task was based on following some general historical principles including: the reduction of subjectivity in the research process, the explicit stating of the nature of the research, and the broadening of the scope of the research to clearly deal with the development of the policy problem and its solution within the broader historical context. Of course, of paramount importance for this type of historical enquiry is that the historian adheres to the canons of general historical scholarship with accuracy and relevance as guiding principles. Both primary and secondary sources were used in this portion of the study (chapter four), so that, an understanding of the nature of certain changes in the composition of Canadian society, how this led to the federal policy of multiculturalism and how these factors affected education could be gained. This examination led to an understanding of how the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta fit into the broader Canadian experience. This understanding of the broader context was necessary in order to deal with the problem of advocacy where only select data is used to support or weaken a position.

With this understanding it was then possible to evaluate the appropriateness of the policy based on whether the policy fit into the broader historical context of: a large portion Alberta's population being ethnic minorities (neither of British or French origin), increased tolerance and allowance for ethnic diversity in Alberta, and the increase in the influence and voice of the ethnic minorities resulting in them demanding a change in policy. Based on the findings of chapter four in relation to the development of immigration policy, the change in the ethnic and linguistic composition of Alberta and Canada and the development of the ethnic minority voice, it was determined that the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta could be considered an appropriate policy response.

Thus, the methodology designed in the first part of chapter three was applied in chapter four and demonstrated that the Heritage Language Policy was an appropriate policy response based on the aforementioned criteria. This meant that the first major aspect of the analysis, namely, determining the appropriateness of the policy given the broader historical context, was accomplished.

This left the second major aspect of the analysis - determining whether and how the policy-makers used history in the development of the policy - for chapter five.

The approach that was used in determining the extent to which historical information was used appropriately or misused was based in large part on Neustadt and May's work. As stated previously, Neustadt and May focus on the majority of policy-makers who use history in the public policy-making process, but do so badly. How do these public policy-makers use history badly? They are "influenced by beliefs about what history teaches or portends"[40] not what actually happened in the past. That is, they use what they believe to be history to form analogies and/or parallels between the past and the present and from these incorrect analogies and/or parallels they envision the future.[41] Thus, to begin the process, it was necessary to explain Neustadt and May's "mini-methods" and how they were adapted into the "Modified Techniques". It was these "Modified Techniques" namely the "K-U-P/L-D" technique, the "Issue History" technique and the "Placement" technique, which were used to determine whether and how the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta used history.

Through document analysis and personal interviews it was determined that the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy did not understand the proper use of history and thus, did not use the "Modified Techniques" or any similar techniques to more clearly define their concerns and objectives. In fact, as has been shown, there was virtually no historical analysis or research done by the policy-makers. It was based on what the policy-makers believed had happened in the past and this centered around an untested assumption that the ethnic groups, who had made important contributions to the development and life of Alberta, would lose their heritage and identity if something was not done and if this happened it would result in a loss to the cultural life of Alberta. The government, more specifically the cabinet, did not request historical or any other type of research to support this assumption. It simply assumed that in the past ethnic groups had lost their cultural identity (e.g. the American melting pot) and they did not want the same to happen in Alberta. The result was that the assumption was simply accepted.[42] Thus, based on the perceived contributions of ethnic groups and what the cabinet thought had happened to ethnic groups in the past, the government took the initiative, so that, Alberta would not lose this 'multicultural' aspect of its life.[43]

---

[40] Ernest R. May, "Lessons" of the Past: The Use and Misuse of History in American Foreign Policy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. ix.

[41] Ibid.

Once it was determined that the policy-makers had not made proper use of history, the "Modified Techniques" were applied to determine whether the use of such techniques would have stopped the provincial government from announcing this new policy. The answer was no; however, if the policy-makers had applied these or any similar techniques, they would have been rewarded with marginal, and not so marginal, improvements. The marginal improvements might have caused the policy-makers to make slight modifications to the wording of the policy; however, there was one area in which the "Modified Techniques" might have caused some serious re-thinking. If the "Modified Techniques" had been applied the policy-makers would have had a much better understanding of the implications of the Heritage Language Policy which would have allowed the policy-makers to better prepare for the implementation of the policy. It is doubtful whether access to this type of information would have caused the policy-makers to reject the Heritage Language Policy, especially given the political climate and the fact that an election was only months away, the decision would probably have been the same. However, the use of the "Modified Techniques" might have resulted in some type of modifications or restrictions on the policy which would have resulted in, at least, marginal improvements to the development of the Heritage Language Policy.

---

[42] Interview, Robert Clark - former Minister of Education, May 15, 1991.

[43] Ibid.

The analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta serves as an example of how history can be used in the analysis of a Canadian micropolicy. Thus, the general macropolicy methods of Neustadt and May are transferable to micropolicy analysis. Indeed Neustadt and May are quite correct to talk about "marginal improvements" in the public policy-making process[44] because this process involves several disciplines and a multitude of factors and interest groups. It would be naive to believe that the proper use of history could bring about dramatic changes in the public policy-making process. Nevertheless, the proper use of history can bring marginal improvements as was demonstrated with the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta.

---

[44] Neustadt and May, op. cit., p. xvii.

It is important to point out that this concept of the proper use of history being valuable to public policy-making is relatively new. The policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy were not unique in their limited use of history. At the same time, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, there were two major groups involved in educational planning and research: the Worth Commission on Educational Planning and the Human Resources Research Council.[45] Both of these groups were involved in educational planning in Alberta. Professor Erwin Miklos indicated that, in his view, "the generalization that the sense of history did not play an important role in their educational planning is valid."[46] There appeared to be a general belief in both these groups that the future would be very different from the past and that there were few lessons to be learned from the past.[47] Thus, those involved in giving advice to the government were more concerned with the future than with the past and saw no need to examine what had occurred historically. A tendency to give only limited attention to the historical context was evident also in policy-related research conducted elsewhere. For example, with some notable exceptions, doctoral research in educational administration in the 1960s tended not to emphasize historical perspectives.[48] And more recently, the work of Dr. David MacKay, indicates that historical perspective continues to be of limited importance in the processes used for policy analysis in educational administration.[49] Thus, the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta were not unique in their limited use of history, the limited use of history was very much in keeping with the times.

---

[45] The Human Resources Research Council was involved in research dealing with educational planning. For example: E. Miklos, P. Bourgette and S. Cowley, Perspectives on Educational Planning. (Edmonton: Human Resources Research Council, 1972).

[46] Interview, Dr. Erwin Miklos - Professor, Department of Educational Administration, May 30, 1991.

[47] Ibid.

This is important to understand because this study was not designed to 'point fingers' or condemn the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy. Instead this study set out to demonstrate that public policy-makers do not take advantage of the proper use of history to enhance the public policy-making process. Although it is always dangerous to make generalizations, it can be said that the policy-makers involved in the development of the Heritage Language Policy did not take advantage of the proper use of history to bring, at least, marginal improvements to this policy. What do these findings mean? They mean that there is a role for the proper use of history in the analysis and the development of public policy including educational policy.

---

[48] Erwin Miklos, Evolution of Doctoral Research in Educational Administration at the University of Alberta, 1958-1990. (Draft Version) (Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1990).

[49] David A. MacKay, "Policy Processes in Alberta Education: An Analysis of Four Studies" in The Canadian Administrator, volume 30, number 1, October 1990. (Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1990).

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

As previously mentioned, this study was a first attempt to combine a number of general principles of historical research with specific techniques in the analysis of the development of the Heritage Language Policy of Alberta (1971). Thus, future studies could be related either to the general topic of the use of history in educational policy or to Alberta's language of instruction policy(s). Some possible topics for future research are:

1. an analysis of the development of Alberta's 1968 policy which permitted French to be used as a language of instruction.

2. an analysis of the implementation of the Heritage Language Policy in 1973-1974 by the Progressive Conservative government.

3. an analysis of the introduction of federal funding for English-French bilingual education and heritage language programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberta Gazette. Edmonton, September 15, 1970.

Alberta Multiculturalism Commission. Multiculturalism: Focus of the 90's. Edmonton, 1989.

Anderson, Alan B. and Frideres, James S.. Ethnicity in Canada: Theoretical Perspectives. Toronto: Butterworths & Co. Ltd., 1981.

Annual Report of the Department of Education of the North-West Territories 1903. Regina, North-West Territories: John A. Reid, Government Printer, 1904.

Annual Reports of the Department of Education of the Province of Alberta 1905 - 1971. Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1906 - 1972.

Audet, Louis-Philippe. Historie de l'enseignment au Quebec, Tome 1 1608 - 1840. Montreal/Toronto: Holt, Rinehart et Winston Ltee., 1971.

Bailyn, Bernard. Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press and New York: W.W. Norton, 1960.

Bede, The Venerable. The Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation (translator: John Stevens). London: Hamish, Hamilton Ltd., 1969.

Blake, Christopher. "Can History Be Objective?" in Theories of History edited by Patrick Gardiner. New York: The Free Press, 1959, pp. 329-343.

Braudel, F.. On History. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Brown, Jennifer. "A Colony of Very Useful Hands" in The Beaver, Spring 1977, pp. 39-43.

Burnet, Jean R.. "Multiculturalism" in The Canadian Encyclopedia, volume 3. Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers Limited, 1988, p. 1401.

______________. "Multiculturalism in Canada" in Ethnic Canada: Identities and Inequalities edited by Leo Driedger. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, Ltd., 1987, pp. 65-79.

Burnet, Jean R. and Palmer, Howard. Coming Canadians: An Introduction to a History of Canada's People. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Inc., 1988.

Butterfield, Herbert. The Whig Interpretation of History. New York: W.W. Norton, 1965.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, 1982.

Canadian Multiculturalism Act. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, 1981.

Carney, Robert J.. "Going to School in Upper Canada" in Canadian Education: Historical Themes and Contemporary Issues edited by E. Brian Titley. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1990, pp. 9-44.

______________. "The Grey Nuns and the Children of Holy Angels" in Proceedings of the Fort Chipewyan and Fort Vermilion Bicentennial Conference edited by Patricia A. McCormack and R. Geoffrey Ironside. Edmonton: Boreal Institute, University of Alberta, 1990, pp. 289-298.

Carr, Edward H.. What is History? London: MacMillan & Co., Ltd., 1961.

Clark, Lovell. "Plain English: Manitoba 1890" in Horizon Canada edited by Benoit Robert, Michael MacDonald and Raynald Nadeau. Quebec: Universite Laval, 1987, vol. 6., pp. 1681-1687.

Collingwood, R.G.. The Idea of History. London: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Commission on Educational Planning. Interim Proposals: N-12 Education Task Force. Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1970.

Connell-Smith, Gordon and Lloyd, Howell A.. The Relevance of History. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1972.

Cummins, Jim (editor). Heritage Languages in Canada: Research Perspectives. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1984.

Czumer, W.A.. Recollections About the Life of the First Ukrainian Settlers in Canada. Edmonton: The Printing Services, University of Alberta, 1981.

Daniels, Robert V.. Studying History: How and Why. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1981.

Dawson, Donald. Community Power and Ethnic School Programs (Ph.D. dissertation). Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1982.

Dawson, Donald and Brian Titley. "The Origins of Schooling in Selected Regions of Canada: An Interpretation" in Education in Canada: An Interpretation edited by E. Brian Titley and Peter J. Miller. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1982, pp. 5-24.

Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. Indian Education Paper - Phase 1. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, 1982.

Department of the Secretary of State for Canada. Multiculturalism . . . being Canadian. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1987.

Dirks, Gerald E.. "Immigration Policy" in The Canadian Encyclopedia, volume 2. Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers Limited, 1988, pp. 1047-1048.

Dray, William. ""Explaining What" in History" in Theories of History edited by Patrick Gardiner. New York: The Free Press, 1959, pp. 402-408.

______________. Philosophy of History. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964.

Dunn, William N.. Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1981.

Edwards III, George C. and Sharkansky, Ira. The Policy Predicament: Making and Implementing Public Policy. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1978.

Focus on Canada: Ethnic Diversity in Canada. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services, 1990.

Francis, R. Douglas, Jones, Richard and Smith, Donald B.. Origins: Canadian History to Confederation. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada Limited, 1988.

Galbraith, V.H.. An Introduction to the Study of History. London: C.A. Watts & Co., 1964.

Gooch, George P.. History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1913.

Government of Alberta. "A New Cultural Policy for the Province of Alberta". Edmonton, July 1971.

Hardy, J.S.. "A Review of Selected Materials in the Educational History of Western Canada: Opportunities for Future Research" in The Journal Of Educational Thought, vol. 14, no. 2, 1980, pp. 64-79.

Hempel, Carl. "The Function of General Laws in History" in Theories of History edited by Patrick Gardiner. New York: The Free Press, 1959, pp. 344-355.

Herodotus. The History (translator: David Greene). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Hexter, J.H.. Doing History. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1971.

______________. Reappraisals in History: New Views on History and Society in Early Modern Europe. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

House of Commons Debates 1971a. Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, 1971.

Houston, Susan E. and Prentice, Alison. Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth Century Ontario. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Immigration and Population Statistics. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1974.

Jaenen, Cornelius. "Amerindian Views of French Culture in the Seventeenth Century" in the Canadian Historical Review, vol. LV, no. 3, September 1974.

______________. The Role of the Church in New France. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, Ryerson, 1976.

Johnson, F. Henry. A Brief History of Canadian Education. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Company of Canada Limited, 1968.

Kach, Nick. "Education and Ethnic Acculturation: A Case Study" in Essays in Canadian Education edited by Nick Kach, Kas Mazurek, R.S. Patterson and Ivan DeFaveri. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1986, pp. 41-60.

Kalbach, Warren E.. "Growth and Distribution of Canada's Ethnic Population, 1871-1971" in Ethnic Canada: Identities and Inequalities edited by Leo Driedger. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd., 1987, pp. 82-110.

Katz, Michael. School Reforms: Past and Present. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971.

Kuhn, Thomas S.. The Structure of Scientific Revolution. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Lupul, Manoly R.. Relations in Education Between the State and the Roman Catholic Church in the Canadian North-West with Special Reference to the Provisional District of Alberta from 1880 to 1905 (Ph.D. dissertation). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, 1963.

________________. "Minority Languages in the Alberta School System" in Report on the Conference on Multiculturalism for Canada. Edmonton: University of Alberta, Ukrainian Students' Club, August 29, 1970, pp. 51-59.

________________. "The Politics of Ukrainian Bilingualism in Alberta" in TEMA. Saskatchewan: Saskatchewan Teachers of Ukrainian, vol. 6, no. 1, Dec. 1974, pp. 31-37.

Mabindisa, Issac K.. The Praying Man: The Life and Times of Henry Bird Steinhauer (Ph.D. dissertation). Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1984.

MacDonald, Neil. "David J. Goggin, Promoter of National Schools" in Profiles of Canadian Educators edited by R.S. Patterson, J.W. Chalmers and J.W. Friesen. Toronto: Heath, 1974, pp. 167-185.

MacKay, David A.. "Policy Processes in Alberta Education: An Analysis of Four Studies" in The Canadian Administrator, volume 30, number 1, October 1990. Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1990, pp. 1-7.

Magee, Bryan. Karl Popper. New York: Viking Press, 1973.

Magnuson, Roger. A Brief History of Quebec Education. Montreal: Harvest House, 1980.

Marwick, Arthur. The Nature of History (3rd edition). London: MacMillan Education, Ltd., 1989.

May, Ernest R.. Lessons of the Past: The Uses and Misuses of History in American Foreign Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Marsak, Leonard M. (editor). The Nature of Historical Inquiry. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Mazurek, Kas. "Interpreting Educational History - With a Commentary on the Social Context of Early Public Schooling" in Essays in Canadian Education edited by Nick Kach, Kas Mazurek, R.S. Patterson and Ivan Defraveri. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1986, pp. 23-40.

Mazurek, Kas and Nick Kach. "Multiculturalism, Society and Education" in Canadian Education: Historical Themes and Contemporary Issues edited by E. Brian Titley. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1990, pp. 133-160.

Miklos, E., Bourgette, P. and Cowley S.. Perspectives on Educational Planning. Edmonton: Human Resources Research Council, 1972.

Miklos, Erwin. Evolution of Doctoral Research in Educational Administration at the University of Alberta, 1958 - 1990 (Draft Version). Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1990.

Morton, W.L.. The Kingdom Of Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1969.

Neustadt, Richard E. and May, Ernest R.. Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers. New York: The Free Press, 1986.

Nixon, Richard M.. Leaders. New York: Warner Books, Inc., 1982.

Palmer, Howard. Land of the Second Chance. Lethbridge, Alberta: The Lethbridge Herald, 1972.

Patterson, E. Palmer. The Canadian Indian: A History Since 1500. Don Mills, Ontario: Collier MacMillan Canada Ltd., 1972.

Prentice, Alison. "Education and the Metaphor of the Family: the Upper Canadian Example" in History of Education Quarterly, 12, no. 3 (1972).

Rich, E.E.. Hudson's Bay Company Letters Outwards, 1679 - 1694. London: Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1948.

Royal Charter and Statutes of the Society of Antiquaries of London, 1800.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups (Volume 4). Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, 1969.

Sixty-Fifth Annual Report of the Department of Education of the Province of Alberta, 1970. Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1971.

Statutes of the Province of Alberta 1905 -1971. Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1906 -1972.

Statutes of the Province of Alberta, 1964. Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1965.

Statutes of the Province of Alberta, 1968. Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1969.

Strom, Harry. "An Address to the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, Edmonton Branch" (unpublished). Edmonton, 1971.

The Eighth Annual Report of the Department of Education of the Province of Alberta 1913. Edmonton: J.W. Jeffrey, Government Printer, 1914.

The North-West Territories Ordinances, 1875 printed in Statutes of Alberta. Edmonton.

The North-West Territories: 1901 Ordinances. Regina, North-West Territories: John A. Reid, Government Printer, 1902.

The School Act, 1970. Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1970.

The School Act, 1971. Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1971.

The School Ordinance of the North-West Territories, 1884 printed in Statutes of Alberta. Edmonton.

Titley, E. Brian. "Tradition, Change and Education in French Canada" in Education in Canada: An Interpretation edited by E. Brian Titley and Peter J. Miller. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1982, pp. 45-56.

______________. "Indian Industrial Schools in Western Canada" in Schools in the West edited by Nancy M. Sheehan, J. Donald Wilson and David C. Jones. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1986, pp. 133-153.

________________. "Religion, Culture and Power: The School Question in Manitoba" in Canadian Education: Historical Themes and Contemporary Issues edited by E. Brain Titley. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1990, pp. 45-77.

Tosh, John. The Pursuit of History. London: Longman Group UK Limited, 1984.

Troper, Harold. "Immigration" in The Canadian Encyclopedia, volume 2. Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers Limited, 1988, pp. 1045-1047.

Ukrainian Canadian Committee. "Brief to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism". Edmonton, 1964.

Ukrainian Language Association. "Brief to the Commission on Educational Planning". Edmonton, 1970.

Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club of Edmonton. "The Ukrainian, The New Canadian Constitution, The Laws of Alberta and the Policies of the Government of Alberta". Edmonton, 1971.

Usher, Stephen. The Historians of Greece and Rome. London: Hamish Hamilton Ltd., 1969.

Vital Grandin Papers. Edmonton: Oblate Archives, 1875.

von Ranke, Leopold. History of the Reformation in Germany. London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1845.

APPENDIX A

SECTION 150 (1971 School Act):

150. (1) A board may authorize

(a) that French be used as a language of instruction,
or
(b) that any other language be used as a language of instruction

in addition to the English language, in all or any of its schools.

(2) A board authorizing French or any other language as a language of instruction shall comply with the regulations of the Minister.

(3) Notwithstanding section 73, a board, subject to the regulations of the Minister, may employ one or more competent persons to give instruction in French or any other language to all pupils whose parents have signified a willingness that they should receive it.

(4) The course of instruction shall not supersede or in any way interfere with the instruction required by the regulations of the Minister and by this Act.

Chapter 100, Section 150.

Quoted from: The School Act, 1971 (Edmonton: Queen's Printer for Alberta, 1971).

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS:

Dr. T. C. Byrne, former Deputy Minister, Department of Education.
Interview conducted on April 23, 1991.

Mr. Robert Clark, former Minister of Education (Social Credit government, 1968-1971).
Interview conducted on May 15, 1991.

Mr. Fred Colborne, former Social Credit cabinet minister.
Interview conducted on May 24, 1991.

Mr. Lawrence Decore, member of the Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club of Edmonton.
Interview conducted on May 29, 1991.

Mrs. Darlene Haverstock, Secretary, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Alberta.
Interview conducted in March 1991.

Dr. James Hrabi, former Director of Curriculum, Department of Education.
Interview conducted on May 16, 1991.

Dr. Nick Kach, Professor, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Alberta.
Interview conducted in March 1991.

Dr. P. A. Lamoureux, former Associate Director of Curriculum, Department of Education.
Interview conducted on April 22, 1991.

Dr. Erwin Miklos, Professor, Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta.
Interview conducted on May 30, 1991.

APPENDIX B (CONT'D)

Mr. Peter Savaryn, member of the Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club of Edmonton.
Interview conducted on June 7, 1991.

Mr. Ray Speaker, former Social Credit cabinet minister.
Interview conducted on May 24, 1991.

Dr. Michael Strembitsky, Superintendent, Edmonton Public School District.
Interview conducted on May 27, 1991.

Appendix C

SUMMARY OF MINI-METHODS

I. *K-U-P/L-D*

- To help *define* the immediate *situation* ("now") and the decision-maker's *concerns* (problems) in it, from which to draw objectives.

- For use with or without analogues from the past ("then").

Step 1. Separate what is *Known* "now" from what is *Unclear* and both from what is *Presumed* (by the person with the problem or his agent).

Step 2. Do the same for all relevant "thens" that come to mind or others urge (fill in each "then" from *present* knowledge).

Step 3. Compare then with now for *likenesses* and *differences* (skip if no analogues).

Step 4. Articulate specifically what now is of concern and, if possible, commensurate objectives.

N.B.: If concerns and objectives don't come clear, add placement (VII below) and try articulating again; if still unclear, review the history of the issue (II-IV below) and try once more.

II. *The Goldberg rule*

"Don't ask 'What's the problem', ask 'What's the story?' That way you'll find out what the problem really is."

III. *Time-line* (for the issue)

The dates from "now" back to the story's start.

IV. *Journalists' questions*

"When" (time-line) "What" "Where" "Who" "How" "Why"

- Used together to help trace and articulate the history of the issue (the issue is defined by the decision-maker's concerns), for more light on objectives, thence options.

Step 1: With respect to the issue, invoke the Goldberg rule.

Step 2: Plot on the time-line relevant trends, asking journalists' questions as helpful.

Step 3: Plot on the time-line any changes in specifics that appear to have especially high political significance.

Step 4: Articulate objectives and options to match concerns as refined by issue history.

V. *Bets and Odds*

What odds will you give that the presumption proves correct?

and/or

How much of your own money would you wager on it?

- Used to test presumptions uncovered in I. above.

Step 1: Ask either question (or both) of each advisor, in presence of others.

Step 2: Require each to specify what makes his answer different from the others.

Step 3: Encourage argument, promote articulation of differences.

Step 4: Review presumption accordingly.

VI. *"Alexander's question"*

What fresh facts, if at hand, by when, would cause you to change your presumption? (Your direction? Your decision?)

- Another way to test a presumption. Also a way to set up warning signals in advance and schedule contingent reviews ("if we should find these facts, then . . .)

Step 1: Ask the question.

Step 2: Put agreed answers in a tickler system.

Step 3: Commit to a review of presumptions - or decisions - if tickler shows facts found.

Step 4: (contingent) Review accordingly and amend, as indicated, definitions of situation, concerns, objectives and options.

VII. *"Placement"*

	Individual	Institution
Time-line	Since parents' adolescence	Since start of key components
Events	Public history widely taught or reported	laws, leaders or controversies widely reported
(Special Events)	widely known to distinct publics	(same as for individuals)
Details	Personal history of record and available	Internal history: structures, procedures (esp. incentives)

- To help "place" relative strangers, either people or organizations, by inferring personal outlook or institutional proclivity from the history external signs suggest may be in someone else's head or built into incentives in somebody else's bailiwick.

Step 1: Articulate initial stereotype about the other person or organization.

Step 2: Lay out the relevant time-line.

Step 3: Plot relevant events (and/or special events) and details appropriately defined, with approximate dates.

Step 4: Draw inferences about the person's likely outlook or the organization's likely approach in order to sophisticate initial stereotype-subject to reality checks as (if) direct evidence comes in.

Quoted from: Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May, Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers (New York: The Free Press,1986), pp. 273 - 275.